ED 018 243 24 LI 000 372

THE IDENTIFICATION AND EXAMINATION OF AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH IN SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP. FINAL REPORT.

BY- WOODWORTH, MARY L.
WISCONSIN UNIV., MADISON

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-8178 PUB DATE NOV 67
OFFICE OF EDUCATION (DHEW), WASHINGTON, D.C.
CONTRACT OEC-6-10-347
EDRS PRICE MF-$1.25 HC-$12.28 305P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LIBRARY RESEARCH, *SCHOOL LIBRARIES, *RESEARCH NEEDS, *LIBRARIANS, *EVALUATION, LIBRARY INSTRUCTION, LIBRARY SERVICES, LIBRARY PROGRAMS, LIBRARY EDUCATION, RESEARCH PROBLEMS,

THE PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY WERE (1) TO IDENTIFY RESEARCH PROBLEMS IN SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP, (2) TO INDICATE THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEMS AND NEEDS IDENTIFIED, AND (3) TO SEARCH FOR AND COMMENT UPON EXISTING RESEARCH IN THE FIELD. OPINIONS ON THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH NEEDS AND PROBLEMS WERE GATHERED THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO SCHOOL-LIBRARY LEADERS. THE LEADERS WERE PRINCIPALLY CONCERNED WITH NEEDED RESEARCH FOR LIBRARY INSTRUCTION, SERVICES, AND STATE AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS. ITEMS OF GREATEST CONCERN WERE--THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE LIBRARY TO THE TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESS, TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE LIBRARY, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTERS, ATTITUDES OF THE SCHOOL STAFF, EVALUATION OF LIBRARIES, PERSONNEL STUDIES, AND THE EDUCATION OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANS. AN EXAMINATION OF THE EXISTING RESEARCH REVEALED THAT CURRENT EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH IN SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP IS ALMOST NON-EXISTENT, ALTHOUGH STATUS REPORTS ABOUND. IT WAS CONCLUDED THAT THE RESPONSES IN THIS PROJECT INDICATED A DEFINITE INTEREST IN RESEARCH AND RESEARCH NEEDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP ON THE PART OF LIBRARIANS, AND IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT RESEARCH AND RESEARCH TECHNIQUES SHOULD BECOME A DEFINITE PART OF THE CURRICULUM FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIANS AND THAT INCREASED OPPORTUNITY TO INITIATE AND PARTICIPATE IN LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL RESEARCH PROJECTS SHOULD BE AFFORDED SCHOOL LIBRARIANS. APPENDIXES INCLUDE A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF 252 ITEMS, THE INSTRUMENT USED FOR THIS STUDY, AND SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES INDICATING RESPONSES TO THE AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH. (AUTHOR/JB)

BR-6-8178
P.A.24

ED018243

FINAL REPORT
PROJECT NO. 6-8178
CONTRACT NO. OE-6-10-347

The Identification and Examination of Areas of Needed Research in School Librarianship

Mary L. Woodworth

University of Wisconsin

Madison, Wisconsin

November, 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with The Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The research and evaluation reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Act

CONTENTS

PAGE

SUMMARY i

INTRODUCTION 1

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH (METHOD AND FINDINGS) 9

EXISTING RESEARCH 130

CONCLUSIONS 219

BIBLIOGRAPHY 229

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A, INSTRUMENT A-1

APPENDIX B, INSTRUMENT, PART II B-1

APPENDIX C, INTRODUCTORY AND OTHER LETTERS C-1

APPENDIX D, SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES D-1

TABLES

	PAGE
RESPONSE TO INITIAL LETTER	12
QUESTIONNAIRE SENT	13
COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGES OF THE SUBGROUPS	13
COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGES	14
TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES	15
GRAND MEANS FOR EACH OF THE AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH	96
TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES	97
RESPONSE TO PART II BY SUBGROUPS	106
RANK ORDER OF THE AREAS	220
ITEMS RATED "ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL" BY 50 PER CENT OR MORE OF THE RESPONDENTS (IN RANK ORDER)	222
ITEMS RATED "ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL" BY 40-49.99 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS (IN RANK ORDER)	223
ITEMS RATED "ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL" BY 33-39.99 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS (IN RANK ORDER)	225
SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES	D-1

Summary

Purpose and Problem:

The purposes of this study were: (1) to identify research problems in school librarianship; (2) to provide an indication of the relative importance of the problems identified; and (3) to search for and comment upon existing research in the field.

Methodology:

Individual problems and areas of research were identified through a search of the literature and through successive, suggested revisions of a list of research needs. Opinions on the relative importance of the problems were secured from "school-library leaders," by means of (1) a questionnaire which categorized the list of research needs into areas of research and required a rating on an importance-unimportance scale; and (2) an "open-end" questionnaire. Existing research was identified, examined, and reviewed.

Findings:

School-library leaders evinced interest in every area of the research needs, being principally concerned with library instruction, services, and state and federal programs. Little interest was shown in historical studies or in technical studies of limited generalizability. Items of greatest concern were: the contributions of the library to the teaching/learning process; teacher education and the library; instructional materials centers; centralization; attitudes of the school staff; evaluation of libraries; and personnel studies. A major interest demonstrated by the "open-end" questionnaire was the education of school librarians. A review of existing research in school librarianship lead to the conclusion that research in this field has only made a beginning. Though status studies abound, little controlled, experimental research has taken place. Some interesting descriptions of demonstrations and experimentation in school library programs have been reported.

Conclusions:

If the response of the school-library leaders were indicative of the concerns of all school librarians, then there appeared to have been a definite interest in research and research needs in school librarianship on the part of the librarians. Based on this interest, it was concluded that increased attention to research and research techniques should constitute a definite, planned portion of the curriculum for school librarians, and that increased opportunity to initiate and participate in local, state, and federal research projects in librarianship should be afforded school librarians.

This project is designed to identify and examine problem areas in the field of school librarianship which require further research. School libraries, and their contributions to the whole educational endeavor, have received little research attention. The school library occupies a unique pivotal position within the school, influencing, as it does, school practices and educational change. It is one of the few departments that deals with all curricular and extra-curricular activities of students. The librarian-student relationship is almost the only one in a school that is nonjudgmental, and the librarian is able, thus, to exercise an influence that is quite different from his professional colleagues. The librarian is unusual in the school situation in that he consults with, assists, and affects teachers in all departments, and is generally viewed by the administrator not only as the head of a department, but also as one of the prime figures in the development and extension of the curriculum and the encouragment of independence and excellence in student scholarship.

Since the stimulus provided in certain subject areas by the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and the introduction of and extensive publication on the 1960 STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS, the scope of school librarianship has undergone major changes. Many questions have arisen which need to be identified, explored, and examined for their feasibility for further research. New developments in school centralization and decentralization, the new principle of materials centers, the new role of the elementary school library, new technical possibilities presented by automation and machine operations, and a new emphasis and interest in school libraries within school systems and state departments of education -- all these are reflected in the new problem areas encountered in school libraries today. Other questions concerning library management and organization, supervision, efficient operations, relations with other libraries, student use, effective library instruction, cooperation with administrators and faculties, and audio-visual facilities in libraries are being raised or reconsidered. Innovations in education have also taken place. Varying patterns of school organization, departmentalization, flexible scheduling, team teaching, programmed learning, independent study, new curricular developments, and others have generated alterationsin education, and, of course, in the school library field.

Testimony of library leaders and specialists on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has pointed up the current status of school libraries, and various studies by Gaver, Lowrie, Lohrer, and others have begun the work of research in school librarianship. Exploratory studies are being encouraged through recent publications and projects such as the Knapp Project, the Encyclopedia Britannica Award, the School Library Development Project, and others.

The great changes in federal legislation, mostly in the past ten years, have and will affect schools and school libraries. The amended National Defense Education Act has, for the first time, provided opportunities for school librarians to attend institutes to work on library problems and to supplement their professional preparation. It has also extended the original provisions of the National Defense Education Act into other subject areas. The new Elementary and Secondary Education Act should have great influence on expanding school library facilities and collections. Other bills being considered may also present school libraries and school librarians with added opportunities. Research monies in all fields of education are becoming available for anyone wishing to examine a school library problem, not only through the various acts and provisions administered by the federal government, but also through state departments of education, collegiate research organizations, local school systems, and various associations.

Much, however, remains to be done. Some attempts have been made in the past to identify those problems in the field of school librarianship which need further discussion or investigatory study. Aside from the interesting lists by Taylor on articles wanted by library periodicals, there has been only one listing of needed research in school librarianship. During a conference in Chicago in 1961, called to introduce the STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS, a meeting of library leaders, led by Frances Henne of Columbia and Sara Fenwick of Chicago, was held to discuss needed research areas. This discussion led to the publication of the mimeographed list entitled, RESEARCH NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM. It contained ideas for types of publications (one being a "list of needed research projects") and suggestions for areas to be investigated.

A more recent examination of the problem of research needs in all types of libraries was reported by Frank L. Schick, John C. Frantz, and others in the JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP (Spring, 1963). Containing certain general topics applicable to all types of libraries, it also included a short list of suggestions for research in school librarianship, divided into ideas on administration and supervision, student development and library use, and library functions and use. Based on bibliographic essays originally prepared by the Committee for Research on Inter-Library Cooperation in the Public Library Field (Columbia), the article was supplemented in the school library field by topics suggested by M. H. Mahar and R. L. Darling.

The Gaver report on elementary school libraries' research (ALA BULLETIN, February, 1962) categorized current studies under the topics: " ... status of elementary school libraries; school and public library relations; materials and expenditures; personnel; evaluation of elementary school libraries; pupil outcomes related to elementary school libraries." She also included "Needed Research" in which she identified the following items: (1) uniform gathering of statistics; (2) accessibility studies; (3) school and public relationships and responsibilities; (4) "... roles of the elementary school librarian and library in work with exceptional children and in special teaching situations"; (5) role of the administrator; (6) programs of teacher education insuring knowledge and understanding of the school library and of children's literature; (7) elementary school library service to teachers; (8) starting elementary school libraries; (9) recruiting school librarians; (10) " ... the role of such factors as accessibility, the program of library-related activities, integration of use of reference materials in the instructional program, and the contribution of the library to the learning process, as applied to the elementary school." Gaver had here identified problem areas and current research in elementary school librarianship.

Certain other research has been accomplished. In addition to studies of the U.S. Office of Education (such as the Darling statistical studies and the Mahar work on the responsibilities of state departments of education), several other research projects have recently been completed. Studies included in the Kroll volume concerning libraries of the Pacific Northwest (with its highly interesting work on attitudes of school administrators), the Fiske examination of censorship and selection, the Burress survey on censorship, the status study undertaken by Ahlers in Washington, Gaver's work in elementary school libraries in New Jersey and Puerto Rico, the Jones dissertation on socio-economic factors related to student use, the Lohrer study of school libraries as instructional materials centers -- all these are indicative of problem areas, possible solutions, and research interest by the profession. Many others need to be examined.

The whole picture and potential of education and of the library within the school is altering rapidly. With the changes in schools and school libraries, and with the provisions for assistance to libraries and librarians having been made under the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it is becoming imperative for further research to be iniated to assist in the solutions to unanswered questions.

The need for research in school librarianship has been pointed out. Of the 1959-1964 research projects listed in LIBRARY RESEARCH IN PROGRESS (No. 14), only eight per cent were directly concerned with school libraries. And, in his examination of "The Quantity and Content of Masters' Theses Accepted at Library Schools Offering the Doctor's Degree, 1949-1956" (JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP, Spring, 1963), R.D. Walker found that "School libraries represent a weak second with 71 theses or only 10 per cent of the total" (this figure being based on the total number clearly involving a type of library). In his review of one hundred twenty nine doctoral dissertations since 1930, J.P. Danton commented that, on the basis of titles, "only nine can be said to be of direct pertinence to school library service... " ("Doctoral Study in Librarianship in the United States," COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES, November, 1959). Since the 1961 list of research needs for school libraries, only the short section dealing with school library areas in the Schick article (Schick, F.L. et al., "Library Science Research Needs," JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP, Spring, 1963) and the Gaver report on elementary school library research have appeared

Objectives of Project

This project poses and attempts an answer to the following questions:

1. What are the problem areas in school librarianship that are of prime importance?
2. What studies have been accomplished that will provide, or will assist in, possible solutions to the problems?
3. What areas need further research?

This project, then, has the following objectives:

1. The identification of major problem areas in the field of school librarianship
2. Categorization of the problem areas by their relative importance
3. Review of available studies pertinent to the areas.

Relative Importance of Areas of Needed Research

The first step in this project was the determination of the various problems and questions in which research appeared to be needed. A list of these problems was made after a search of the literature to find any prior lists. As noted above, three such lists were found: the 1961 American Association of School Librarians' research needs; the Schick list for all types of libraries; and, the Gaver examination at the elementary level. The investigator concluded that the recency and extensiveness of the Gaver list precluded any detailed re-examination of the elementary school library field. Therefore, this project deals primarily with the secondary level. These lists formed the beginning of the project, and acknowledgement is made here to their contributions to the final list. Other items were identified through a search of the literature in education and library science, personal knowledge and experience of the investigator, and by querying other librarians.

After a list of items was compiled, the items were placed in the following seventeen areas: aims and objectives of school libraries; school library standards; patterns of school library administration and control; school library personnel; collections; budgets and business practices;

accessibility and use; technical processes; publicity and public relations; guidance functions; library instruction; state, regional, and federal programs; library research methods and statistics; services to teachers and students, and special programs; housing and equipment; relations with other libraries; and selection and censorship.

The first form was referred for comment, additions, and corrections firstly to library educators of all specialities at the Library School, University of Wisconsin, and secondly to a selected small group of practicing school librarians. Revisions were made after each group's contributions. A third and fourth form were used with two different classes in the school library course at the University of Wisconsin and with members of the 1966 NDEA Institute for School Librarians at the University of Wisconsin. A final list and the scaling was devised from the suggestions of these various groups. This final list appears in Appendix A.

After the questionnaire was designed and tried out, it was determined to secure the opinions of leaders in school librarianship. The "leaders" were defined and placed in subgroups as follows:

Subgroup A - directors and officers of the American Association of School Librarians and American Library Association councilors representing the American Association of

School Librarians, as identified by the American Association of School Librarians. This subgroup is composed of those listed above who served for the years 1962-1967.

Subgroup B - presidents of American state and regional school library associations, as identified in "State and Regional School Library Associations", published by the American Association of School Librarians.

Subgroup C - state school library supervisors and consultants, as identified in "State School Library Supervisors, 1965-1966," and supplements, published by the American Association of School Librarians.

Subgroup D - library educators responsible for school library courses, as listed in JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP (Winter, 1966).

All persons were contacted and asked if they would respond to a questionnaire concerning research needs in school librarianship. One hundred eighty-four of two hundred eighty-two answered affirmatively. The table below indicates the response to the initial letter:

TABLE 1. RESPONSE TO INITIAL LETTER

Subgroup	No	Yes	Total	Per cent of Total Group
A	10	38	48	17.02
B	24	37	61	21.63
C	36	64	100	35.46
D	28	45	73	25.88
Total	98	184	282	

Per cent of response

Total group:

No - 34.75 o/o
Yes - 65.24 o/o

Subgroup A:

No - 20,83 o/o
Yes - 79.17 o/o

Subgroup B:

No - 39.34 o/o
Yes - 60.65 o/o

Subgroup C:

No - 36 o/o
Yes - 64 o/o

Subgroup D:

No - 38.35 o/o
Yes - 61.64 o/o

Thus, it can be seen that the responses from library leaders represented what might be termed a self-selected group (65.24 o/o). This group was then sent the questionnaire.

TABLE 2. QUESTIONNAIRES SENT

Subgroup	No. sent	Per cent of group
A	38	20.6
B	37	20.1
C	64	34.7
D	45	24.4

If the percentages of the subgroups of the sample in Table 2 were compared to the percentages of the total group to whom initial letters were sent, it would appear that the sample was approximately proportional to the total group(as shown in Table 1):

TABLE 3. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGES OF THE SUBGROUPS

Subgroup	Per cent of total initial letter group	Per cent of total questionnaire group
A	17.02	20.6
B	21.63	20.1
C	35.46	34.7
D	25.88	24.4

Of the 184 questionnaires sent out, a total of 174 answers were received. Only three persons returned the questionnaire, declining to complete it. Two other unusable questionnaires were returned with the code number omitted, making it impossible to assign them to subgroups. Thus, 169 usuable questionnaires were obtained. The perecntage of the total completed returns was 92.93; the percentage of the total completed usable returns was 91.84.

The percentages of the subgroups are noted below. The percentages of the subgroups which returned usable questionnaires would appear to be approximately proportional to the percentages of those to whom initial letters were sent and of those to whom the questionnaires were sent.

TABLE 4. COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGES

Sub-group	o/o of returned, usable questionnaire	o/o of group sent questionnaires	o/o of group sent initial letter
A	21.3	20.6	17.02
B	18.93	20.1	21.63
C	34.91	34.7	35.46
D	24.85	24.4	25.88

On the following pages are tables of percentages, indicating for each item in the questionnaire (1) the percentages in the scale of the total group and (2) the percentages in the scale of each of the subgroups.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: A-1 Contributions of the school library to the learning process (especially effects on academic achievement)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	.59	5.33	20.12	73.37	.59
A	.00	.00	.00	30.56	69.44	.00
B	.00	.00	9.38	12.50	78.13	.00
C	.00	1.69	5.08	15.25	77.97	.00
D	.00	.00	7.14	23.81	66.67	2.38

QUESTION: A-2 Contributions of the school library to the teaching process

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	.00	5.33	24.26	68.64	1.78
A	.00	.00	.00	13.89	86.11	.00
B	.00	.00	.00	25.00	68.75	6.25
C	.00	.00	6.78	30.51	62.71	.00
D	.00	.00	11.90	23.81	61.90	3.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Historical study of school library development
A-3

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	15.98	41.42	33.14	4.14	.59	4.73
A	22.22	44.44	33.33	.00	.00	.00
B	12.50	40.63	37.50	.00	3.13	6.25
C	18.64	45.76	22.03	5.08	.00	8.47
D	9.52	33.33	45.24	9.52	.00	2.38

QUESTION: School Library Laws (development, current status, contrasts
A-4 among states, etc.)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.96	23.08	43.79	21.30	5.92	2.96
A	2.78	38.89	38.89	13.89	2.78	2.78
B	3.13	9.38	40.63	43.75	.00	3.13
C	5.08	20.34	47.46	13.56	10.17	3.39
D	.00	23.81	45.24	21.43	7.14	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: School Libraries as instructional materials centers
A-5

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	4.14	15.98	23.08	53.85	2.37
A	.00	2.78	13.89	22.22	58.33	2.78
B	.00	3.13	12.50	9.38	75.00	.00
C	1.69	3.39	16.95	25.42	49.15	3.39
D	.00	7.14	19.05	30.95	40.48	2.38

QUESTION: Status studies of school libraries
A-6

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	5.33	20.12	36.09	20.71	13.02	4.73
A	2.78	36.11	33.33	16.67	8.33	2.78
B	3.13	18.75	37.50	15.63	15.63	9.38
C	8.47	15.25	40.68	16.95	15.25	3.39
D	4.76	14.29	30.95	33.33	11.90	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Historical development of school library standards
B-1

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	13.61	39.05	38.46	4.14	.00	4.73
A	13.89	41.67	36.11	2.78	.00	5.56
B	12.50	21.88	56.25	3.13	.00	6.25
C	13.56	50.85	27.12	5.08	.00	3.39
D	14.29	33.33	42.86	4.76	.00	4.76

QUESTION: Study of states' standards and enforcement of standards
B-2

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	11.83	27.81	33.73	22.49	2.96
A	.00	16.67	30.56	22.22	25.00	5.56
B	.00	3.13	9.38	59.38	28.13	.00
C	.00	13.56	37.29	23.73	23.73	1.69
D	4.76	11.90	26.19	38.10	14.29	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Study of regional standards, and enforcement

Group B-3			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	13.02	36.09	31.95	15.38	2.96
A	.00	16.67	36.11	19.44	22.22	5.56
B	.00	3.13	28.13	59.38	9.38	.00
C	.00	20.34	40.68	22.03	15.25	1.69
D	2.38	7.14	35.71	35.71	14.29	4.76

QUESTION: Present status of school libraries as compared with the 1960
B-4 "Standards for School Library Programs"

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	4.73	20.71	37.87	33.14	1.78
A	.00	8.33	16.67	38.89	33.33	2.78
B	.00	3.13	21.88	31.25	43.75	.00
C	3.39	1.69	23.73	38.98	30.51	1.69
D	2.38	7.14	19.05	40.48	28.57	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Establishment and revision of school library standards
B-5 (How often? By whom? etc.)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.96	5.92	21.89	37.28	27.81	4.14
A	2.78	8.33	36.11	33.33	13.89	5.56
B	.00	.00	9.38	50.00	40.83	.00
C	1.69	8.47	15.25	40.68	33.90	.00
D	7.14	4.76	28.57	26.19	21.43	11.90

QUESTION: How do standrds impede or help school library development?
B-6

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	2.96	21.89	41.42	31.36	1.78
A	2.78	2.78	25.00	38.89	25.00	5.56
B	.00	.00	15.63	40.63	43.75	.00
C	.00	.00	20.34	42.37	35.59	1.69
D	.00	9.52	26.19	42.86	21.43	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Tools for evaluating school libraries (type, effectiveness, etc.)
B-7

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	1.18	11.24	34.32	52.07	1.18
A	.00	2.78	8.33	19.44	66.67	2.78
B	.00	.00	21.88	40.63	37.50	.00
C	.00	.00	6.78	35.59	57.63	.00
D	.00	2.38	11.90	40.48	42.86	2.38

QUESTION: Organization & administration of school libraries in a campus-house organization (large schools organized into self-contained schools or houses)
C-1

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.73	12.43	40.83	23.08	10.06	8.88
A	2.78	19.44	30.56	25.00	16.67	5.56
B	6.25	3.13	21.88	40.63	12.50	15.63
C	5.08	10.17	55.93	13.56	5.08	10.17
D	4.76	16.67	42.86	21.43	9.52	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Relations of local school libraries to regional materials
C-2 centers

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	7.69	34.91	34.32	17.75	3.55
A	2.78	11.11	30.56	33.33	16.67	5.56
B	.00	3.13	31.25	40.63	15.63	9.38
C	.00	8.47	35.59	30.51	23.73	1.69
D	4.76	7.14	40.48	35.71	11.90	.00

QUESTION: Organizational patterns of multi-librarian school libraries
C-3

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	5.92	31.36	37.28	20.71	2.37
A	2.78	5.56	36.11	30.56	22.22	2.78
B	.00	9.38	34.38	31.25	18.75	6.25
C	.00	5.08	27.12	40.68	27.12	.00
D	7.14	4.68	30.95	42.86	11.90	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: C-4 Practices in organizing and administering elementary, junior high, and/or senior high school libraries.

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	8.88	26.63	31.95	28.99	1.18
A	2.78	16.67	25.00	36.11	19.44	.00
B	.00	.00	12.50	25.00	59.38	3.13
C	1.69	8.47	35.59	30.51	23.73	.00
D	4.76	9.52	26.19	35.71	21.43	2.38

QUESTION: C-5 Organizational patterns and problems of public-library-administered school libraries

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	11.83	21.89	31.36	17.75	12.43	4.73
A	13.89	30.56	22.22	11.11	13.89	8.33
B	3.13	12.50	40.63	28.13	6.25	9.38
C	15.25	18.64	27.12	20.34	16.95	1.69
D	11.90	26.19	38.10	11.90	9.52	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Relations of elementary, junior and senior high school
C-6 libraries and librarians in a school system

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	12.43	40.24	23.08	18.93	1.78
A	5.56	22.22	41.67	16.67	11.11	2.78
B	.00	.00	31.25	25.00	43.75	.00
C	.00	11.86	49.15	25.42	11.86	1.69
D	9.52	14.29	33.33	23.81	16.67	2.38

QUESTION: Problems and patterns of organization and administration of separate and combined school libraries and audio-visual departments

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.37	12.43	34.91	49.11	1.18
A	.00	2.78	11.11	36.11	50.00	.00
B	.00	.00	15.63	28.13	53.13	3.13
C	.00	3.39	8.47	33.90	54.24	.00
D	.00	2.38	16.67	40.48	38.10	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: C-8 Comparison of availablility of materials, services, costs, personnel, etc. between centralized school libraries and departmental resource centers

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	1.18	21.30	36.69	38.46	1.18
A	2.78	.00	16.67	38.89	41.67	.00
B	.00	.00	28.13	43.75	28.13	.00
C	1.69	1.69	25.42	28.81	40.68	1.69
D	.00	2.38	14.29	40.48	40.48	2.38

QUESTION: C-9 Role of the local school library supervisor, and relationships to local school librarians

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	4.73	26.04	36.09	31.36	1.78
A	.00	2.78	36.11	27.78	33.33	.00
B	.00	3.13	18.75	43.75	31.25	3.13
C	.00	1.69	28.81	27.21	40.68	1.69
D	.00	11.90	19.05	50.00	16.67	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Role of the state school library supervisor, and
C-10 relationships to local school librarians

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	8.28	24.85	33.73	30.18	1.78
A	5.56	8.33	27.78	30.56	25.00	2.78
B	.00	6.25	25.00	34.38	34.38	.00
C	.00	1.69	22.03	32.20	42.37	1.69
D	.00	19.05	26.19	38.10	14.29	2.38

QUESTION: Exploration of the effectiveness, services, and use of a
C-11 single "community" library serving junior colleges, elementary, secondary schools and the public

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	7.10	21.30	29.30	29.59	17.75	6.51
A	5.56	25.00	25.00	16.67	19.44	8.33
B	3.13	18.75	34.38	12.50	18.75	12.50
C	8.47	18.64	32.20	18.64	20.34	1.69
D	9.52	23.81	26.19	21.43	11.90	7.14

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: C-12 Practices and problems in the use of traveling school librarians (those assigned to more than 1 library in more than 1 building)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	15.38	38.46	26.63	14.20	1.78
A	8.33	13.89	44.44	22.22	11.11	.00
B	3.13	9.38	34.38	34.38	15.63	3.13
C	.00	8.47	42.37	27.12	18.64	3.39
D	4.76	30.95	30.95	23.81	9.52	.00

QUESTION: D-1 Certification of school librarians

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	6.51	25.44	30.77	32.54	2.37
A	2.78	8.33	27.78	25.00	33.33	2.78
B	.00	6.25	6.25	40.63	46.88	.00
C	.00	3.39	30.51	33.90	30.51	1.69
D	7.14	9.52	30.95	23.81	23.81	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Educational preparation of school librarians (and recency of training)
D-2

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	2.37	16.57	31.36	47.93	1.18
A	2.78	.00	16.67	33.33	44.44	2.78
B	.00	.00	12.50	31.25	56.25	.00
C	.00	5.08	13.56	30.51	49.15	1.69
D	.00	2.38	23.81	30.95	42.86	.00

QUESTION: Training of non-professional library workers
D-3

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.96	5.92	40.24	28.99	20.12	1.78
A	.00	5.56	38.89	27.78	25.00	2.78
B	.00	6.25	46.88	21.88	25.00	.00
C	3.39	5.08	40.68	32.20	16.95	1.69
D	7.14	7.14	35.71	30.95	16.67	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Continuing education of school librarians
D-4

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	4.73	15.98	50.89	26.04	1.78
A	2.78	2.78	16.67	50.00	25.00	2.78
B	.00	.00	25.00	46.88	28.13	.00
C	.00	6.78	16.95	47.46	25.42	3.39
D	.00	7.14	7.14	59.52	26.19	.00

QUESTION: The personality and "image" of the school librarian
D-5

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	13.02	30.18	23.67	27.22	2.37
A	.00	25.00	27.78	22.22	22.22	2.78
B	.00	12.50	25.00	21.88	40.63	.00
C	5.08	8.47	32.20	15.25	33.90	5.08
D	7.14	9.52	33.33	38.10	11.90	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Use and value of student assistants in the library
D-6

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.73	18.93	30.77	26.04	15.98	3.55
A	2.78	25.00	25.00	25.00	19.44	2.78
B	.00	6.25	25.00	43.75	15.00	.00
C	6.78	22.03	38.98	20.34	8.47	3.39
D	7.14	19.05	28.57	21.43	16.67	7.14

QUESTION: Value of student library assistant experience to the student
D-7

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	14.20	35.50	25.44	18.93	2.37
A	8.33	8.33	36.11	22.22	22.22	2.78
B	.00	3.13	31.25	43.75	21.88	.00
C	3.39	20.34	38.98	22.03	11.86	3.39
D	2.38	19.05	33.33	19.05	23.81	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: School librarians as members of professional organizations
D-8 (participation, benefits, attitudes, etc.)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	18.93	32.54	27.81	17.16	2.37
A	5.56	19.44	30.56	27.78	13.89	2.78
B	.00	3.13	18.75	34.38	43.75	.00
C	.00	23.73	37.29	23.73	11.86	3.39
D	.00	23.81	38.10	28.57	7.14	2.38

QUESTION: National inventory of school library personnel resources
D-9 and needs

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	6.51	31.36	26.04	30.77	4.14
A	.00	11.11	27.78	19.44	33.33	8.33
B	.00	.00	40.63	31.25	28.13	.00
C	.00	8.47	28.81	25.42	33.90	3.39
D	4.76	4.76	30.95	28.57	26.19	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Working conditions in school libraries
D-10

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	8.88	32.54	26.63	26.63	2.96
A	.00	11.11	36.11	36.11	16.67	.00
B	.00	3.13	9.38	34.38	53.13	.00
C	1.69	5.08	45.76	20.34	23.73	3.39
D	7.14	16.67	28.57	21.43	19.05	7.14

QUESTION: Study of the optimum number of personnel (professional, technical, clerical) required to give adequate service
D-11

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	1.18	14.79	28.99	50.89	4.14
A	.00	.00	5.56	27.78	66.67	.00
B	.00	.00	12.50	21.88	62.50	3.13
C	.00	1.69	13.56	30.51	52.54	1.69
D	.00	2.38	26.19	33.33	26.19	11.90

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Study of methods used to fill vacancies temporarily
D-12

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	9.47	26.04	40.24	14.79	5.33	4.14
A	13.89	22.22	47.22	8.33	8.33	.00
B	3.13	12.50	53.13	25.00	6.25	.00
C	6.78	33.90	32.20	13.56	5.08	8.47
D	14.29	28.57	35.71	14.29	2.38	4.76

QUESTION: Study of placement services for school librarians
D-13

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	5.33	31.36	33.14	20.17	4.73	4.73
A	8.33	30.56	38.89	13.89	5.56	2.78
B	.00	15.63	37.50	34.38	9.38	3.13
C	3.39	35.59	30.51	18.64	5.08	6.78
D	9.52	38.10	28.57	19.05	.00	4.76

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: D-14 Study of the motivation of personnel to enter, remain in, or leave school librarianship

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	5.92	27.81	36.09	25.44	3.55
A	.00	8.33	27.78	36.11	27.78	.00
B	.00	.00	28.13	50.00	18.75	3.13
C	1.69	6.78	23.78	33.90	30.51	3.39
D	2.38	7.14	33.33	28.57	21.43	7.14

QUESTION: D-15 Study of recruitment methods and their effectiveness

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	6.51	31.36	31.95	27.81	3.83
A	.00	11.11	30.56	27.78	27.78	2.78
B	.00	3.13	28.13	28.13	37.50	3.13
C	.00	5.08	25.42	38.98	28.81	1.69
D	.00	7.14	42.86	28.57	19.05	3.61

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: D-16 Study of the mobility of school librarians

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.14	27.81	39.64	23.67	1.78	2.96
A	2.78	38.89	47.22	5.56	.00	5.56
B	3.13	12.50	40.63	37.50	3.13	3.13
C	5.08	30.51	40.68	18.64	3.39	1.69
D	4.76	26.19	30.95	35.71	.00	2.38

QUESTION: D-17 Study of the need for double certification requirements for school librarians (education and librarianship)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	8.28	28.40	24.85	30.77	4.14
A	.00	8.33	33.33	22.22	36.11	.00
B	.00	.00	34.38	34.38	25.00	6.25
C	5.08	6.78	22.03	27.12	35.59	3.39
D	7.14	16.67	28.57	16.67	23.81	7.14

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Study of the distinctions (duties, pay, responsibilities,
D-18 training, etc.) among clerical, technical, and professional workers in school libraries.

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	10.65	34.32	23.08	28.40	2.37
A	.00	5.56	33.33	19.44	38.89	2.78
B	.00	9.38	31.25	25.00	31.25	3.13
C	1.69	8.47	30.51	28.81	28.81	1.69
D	2.38	19.05	42.86	16.67	16.67	2.38

QUESTION: Educational preparation of school library supervisors
D-19

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	4.14	17.75	42.01	34.32	1.78
A	.00	8.33	11.11	47.22	30.56	2.78
B	.00	3.13	21.88	31.25	40.63	3.13
C	.00	3.39	15.25	49.15	30.51	1.69
D	.00	2.38	23.81	35.71	38.10	.00

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Certification of school library supervisors
D-20

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	6.51	23.08	40.83	26.63	2.37
A	.00	8.33	19.44	41.47	27.78	2.78
B	.00	3.13	28.13	28.13	37.50	3.13
C	.00	3.39	23.73	47.46	23.73	1.69
D	2.38	11.90	21.43	40.48	21.43	2.38

QUESTION: Duties, responsibilities, and workload of local school
D-21 library supervisors

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	4.14	27.81	39.05	27.81	1.18
A	.00	2.78	25.00	38.89	33.33	.00
B	.00	3.13	21.88	31.25	40.63	3.13
C	.00	1.69	28.81	45.76	23.73	.00
D	.00	9.52	33.33	35.71	19.05	3.66

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Role and responsibilities of state school library supervisors
D-22

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	9.47	23.08	34.91	30.77	1.78
A	.00	13.89	25.00	27.78	30.56	2.78
B	.00	3.13	21.88	37.50	34.38	3.13
C	.00	3.39	18.64	38.98	37.39	1.69
D	.00	19.05	28.57	33.33	19.05	.00

QUESTION: Methods of recruitment and appointment of state school library supervisors
D-23

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.14	11.83	34.32	27.22	18.93	3.55
A	2.78	19.44	33.33	22.22	19.44	2.78
B	.00	9.38	25.00	28.13	34.38	3.13
C	3.39	6.78	38.98	32.20	15.25	3.39
D	9.52	14.29	35.71	23.81	11.90	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: D-24 Relations of local school library supervisors with local administrators and with other local supervisors

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	6.51	28.40	37.28	24.85	2.37
A	.00	5.56	22.22	36.11	36.11	.00
B	.00	6.25	28.13	43.75	18.75	3.13
C	1.69	3.39	28.81	38.98	25.42	1.69
D	.00	11.90	33.33	30.95	19.05	4.76

QUESTION: D-25 Special education preparation/experience for librarians in special programs (e.g., work with the culturally deprived, retarded)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	9.47	33.73	38.46	15.98	1.78
A	.00	5.56	36.11	38.89	19.44	.00
B	.00	9.38	40.63	34.38	12.50	3.13
C	1.69	11.86	37.29	28.81	18.64	1.69
D	.00	9.52	21.43	54.76	11.90	2.38

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: D-26 Non-library tasks assigned to school librarians (especially in relation to non-teaching tasks assigned to teachers)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	19.53	28.99	27.22	18.93	2.96
A	.00	13.89	38.89	30.56	11.11	5.56
B	.00	9.38	18.75	25.00	43.75	3.13
C	.00	27.12	30.51	25.42	15.25	1.69
D	9.52	21.43	26.19	28.57	11.90	2.38

QUESTION: D-27 Relative value of classroom teaching experience as background for the school librarian

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	5.33	33.73	31.95	27.81	1.18
A	.00	8.33	22.22	36.11	33.33	.00
B	.00	3.13	28.13	40.63	25.00	3.13
C	.00	3.39	40.68	22.03	33.90	.00
D	.00	7.14	38.10	35.71	16.67	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: D-28 Relative value of an undergraduate liberal arts background for the school librarian

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	5.92	39.05	31.36	21.89	1.78
A	.00	8.33	30.56	33.33	25.00	2.78
B	.00	3.13	31.25	34.38	28.13	3.13
C	.00	3.39	50.85	22.03	23.73	.00
D	.00	9.52	35.71	40.48	11.90	2.38

QUESTION: E-1 Practices and problems of selling materials (paperbacks, etc.) in school libraries

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	10.06	34.32	37.87	8.88	5.92	2.96
A	16.67	27.78	50.00	2.78	2.78	.00
B	3.13	28.13	40.63	12.50	15.63	.00
C	5.08	42.37	30.51	11.86	5.08	5.08
D	16.67	33.33	35.71	7.14	2.38	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: E-2 Professional materials collection - selection, location, size, recency, utilization, etc.

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	8.28	39.05	28.40	21.89	.00
A	5.56	13.89	41.67	27.78	11.11	.00
B	.00	6.25	28.13	40.63	25.00	.00
C	1.69	3.39	37.29	23.73	33.90	.00
D	2.38	11.90	47.62	26.19	11.90	.00

QUESTION: E-3 Selection principles for printed materials (especially in different subject areas)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	7.10	29.59	34.32	26.63	1.18
A	.00	11.11	36.11	27.78	25.00	.00
B	.00	.00	18.75	43.75	37.50	.00
C	.00	10.17	27.12	37.29	25.42	.00
D	4.76	4.76	35.71	28.57	21.43	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: E-4 Selection principles for non-print materials (especially in different subject areas)

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	4.14	20.71	30.18	42.60	1.18
A	.00	8.33	19.44	16.67	55.56	.00
B	.00	.00	18.75	40.63	40.63	.00
C	.00	5.08	20.34	30.51	44.07	.00
D	4.76	2.38	23.81	33.33	30.95	4.76

QUESTION: E-5 Effectiveness of selection tools for printed materials especially in different subject areas)

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	4.73	29.59	35.50	30.18	.00
A	.00	5.56	30.56	30.56	33.33	.00
B	.00	3.13	18.75	46.88	31.25	.00
C	.00	5.08	28.81	32.20	33.90	.00
D	.00	4.76	38.10	35.71	21.43	.00

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Effectiveness of selection tools for non-print materials
E-6 (especially in different subject areas)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.96	15.98	31.95	48.52	.59
A	.00	5.56	16.67	19.44	58.33	.00
B	.00	6.25	9.38	43.75	40.63	.00
C	.00	.00	16.95	32.20	49.15	1.69
D	.00	2.38	19.05	33.33	45.24	.00

QUESTION: Paperback books in school libraries (use, effectiveness,
E-7 organization, costs, etc.)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	13.02	44.38	28.40	11.83	1.78
A	2.78	5.56	50.00	33.33	8.33	.00
B	.00	3.13	40.63	34.38	21.88	.00
C	.00	15.25	42.37	27.12	13.56	1.69
D	.00	23.81	45.24	21.43	4.76	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Methods of evaluating the school library collections
E-8

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.96	12.43	31.95	52.66	.00
A	.00	2.78	16.67	19.44	61.11	.00
B	.00	.00	9.38	25.00	65.63	.00
C	.00	.00	8.47	33.90	57.63	.00
D	.00	9.52	16.67	45.24	28.57	.00

QUESTION: Various methods of acquiring materials (problems,
E-9 comparative costs, etc.)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	6.51	43.79	24.85	21.30	1.78
A	.00	8.33	44.44	16.67	25.00	5.56
B	.00	3.13	34.38	34.38	28.13	.00
C	3.39	3.39	50.85	23.73	16.95	1.69
D	2.38	11.90	40.48	26.19	19.05	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: E-10 Methods and costs of weeding collections

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	21.30	40.24	22.49	11.83	1.78
A	.00	27.78	38.89	25.00	5.56	2.78
B	.00	9.38	28.13	34.38	25.00	3.13
C	3.39	25.42	38.89	20.34	11.84	.00
D	4.76	19.05	52.38	14.29	7.14	2.38

QUESTION: E-11 Use and effectiveness of state-approved lists in materials selection

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	5.92	21.89	39.05	15.98	14.20	2.96
A	5.56	30.56	44.44	5.56	11.11	2.78
B	.00	9.38	40.63	25.00	21.88	3.13
C	10.17	23.73	30.51	13.56	18.64	3.39
D	4.76	21.43	45.24	21.43	4.76	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: E-12 Study of the use, justification, and problems of "closed-shelf" collections

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	12.43	28.40	37.87	10.65	7.69	2.96
A	11.11	38.89	16.67	13.89	16.67	2.78
B	9.38	12.50	56.25	9.38	12.50	.00
C	13.56	27.50	40.68	10.17	5.08	3.39
D	14.29	33.33	38.10	9.52	.00	4.76

QUESTION: E-13 Study of the use, justification and problems of reserve book collections

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	7.10	31.36	39.05	13.61	7.10	1.78
A	11.11	38.89	19.44	11.11	16.67	2.78
B	.00	15.63	56.25	18.75	6.25	3.13
C	6.78	32.20	40.68	15.25	5.08	.00
D	9.52	35.71	40.48	9.52	2.38	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Study of the extent of duplication necessary and desirable
E-14 in a school library

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	17.75	40.24	22.49	16.57	1.18
A	2.78	11.11	38.89	25.00	22.22	.00
B	.00	12.50	34.38	34.38	18.75	.00
C	1.69	15.25	42.37	23.73	15.25	1.69
D	2.38	30.95	42.86	9.52	11.90	2.38

QUESTION: Study of "loss" rates in school libraries
E-15

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	7.69	31.36	36.09	12.43	11.83	.59
A	5.56	25.00	41.67	11.11	16.67	.00
B	3.13	25.00	31.25	18.75	21.88	.00
C	10.17	35.59	37.29	8.47	8.47	.00
D	9.52	35.11	33.33	14.29	4.76	2.38

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Adequacy of school library budgets
F-1

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	5.33	21.30	27.22	42.60	2.37
A	.00	11.11	8.33	25.00	52.78	2.78
B	.00	.00	9.38	34.38	56.25	.00
C	1.69	5.08	27.12	23.73	40.68	1.69
D	2.38	4.76	33.33	28.57	26.19	4.76

QUESTION: Planning and controlling library budgets
F-2

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	4.73	27.22	37.87	26.63	2.37
A	.00	16.67	19.44	27.78	33.33	2.78
B	.00	.00	15.63	40.63	43.75	.00
C	1.69	1.69	35.59	37.29	22.03	1.69
D	2.38	2.38	30.95	45.24	14.29	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Study of the business practices and records of school
F-3 libraries

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	15.98	34.32	28.40	17.16	1.78
A	2.78	27.78	25.00	30.56	8.33	5.56
B	.00	6.25	28.13	40.63	25.00	.00
C	3.39	8.47	40.68	27.12	20.34	.00
D	2.38	23.81	38.10	19.05	14.29	2.38

QUESTION: Problems of allocating library funds to school departments
F-4 for purchase of library materials

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	11.24	42.01	28.40	14.20	1.78
A	.00	16.67	33.33	38.89	5.56	5.56
B	3.13	9.38	21.88	37.50	28.13	.00
C	3.39	6.78	50.85	20.34	18.64	.00
D	2.38	14.29	52.38	23.81	4.76	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: F-5 Methods of allocating, distributing, and accounting for state and federal aids for school libraries

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	8.88	28.99	31.36	27.22	2.96
A	.00	16.67	41.67	13.89	22.22	5.56
B	.00	.00	21.88	28.13	50.00	.00
C	1.69	6.78	23.73	38.98	28.81	.00
D	.00	11.90	30.95	38.10	11.90	7.14

QUESTION: F-6 Relationship of the school library budget to the total instructional budget

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.96	21.30	32.54	42.01	1.18
A	.00	5.56	16.67	25.00	50.00	2.78
B	.00	3.13	12.50	31.25	53.13	.00
C	.00	1.69	20.34	33.90	44.07	.00
D	.00	2.38	33.33	38.10	23.81	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Programs of extended use of school library facilities
G-1 (evening, weekend, summer)

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	2.37	22.49	39.05	34.91	.59
A	.00	2.78	19.44	33.33	44.44	.00
B	3.13	.00	15.63	37.50	43.75	.00
C	.00	1.69	25.42	40.68	30.51	1.69
D	.00	4.76	26.19	42.86	26.19	.00

QUESTION: Evaluating student use of the school library
G-2

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	1.78	17.16	34.91	44.97	.59
A	.00	2.78	16.67	25.00	55.56	.00
B	.00	.00	18.75	40.63	40.63	.00
C	1.69	1.69	20.34	35.59	38.98	1.69
D	.00	2.38	11.90	38.10	47.62	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Accessibility of school libraries to bus-transported students
G-3

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	6.51	40.83	31.95	17.16	2.37
A	.00	2.78	47.22	25.00	19.44	5.56
B	.00	6.25	31.25	40.63	21.88	.00
C	1.69	1.69	45.76	27.12	22.03	1.69
D	2.38	16.67	35.71	38.10	4.76	2.38

QUESTION: Patterns of controlling access to libraries
G-4

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.14	9.47	37.38	27.81	18.93	2.37
A	.00	5.56	41.67	25.00	25.00	2.78
B	3.13	9.38	15.63	40.63	31.25	.00
C	5.08	10.17	45.76	22.03	13.56	3.39
D	7.14	11.90	38.10	28.57	11.90	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, impertance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Use of school libraries in independent study programs and
G-5 traditionally organized programs

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	1.18	20.71	33.73	43.79	.59
A	.00	5.56	16.67	25.00	52.78	.00
B	.00	.00	12.50	43.75	43.75	.00
C	.00	.00	25.42	30.51	42.37	1.69
D	.00	.00	23.81	38.10	38.10	.00

QUESTION: Influence of various factors (such as accessibility) on
G-6 the utilization of library services

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	4.14	26.04	38.46	30.18	1.18
A	.00	5.56	22.22	36.11	36.11	.00
B	.00	3.13	28.13	37.50	28.13	3.13
C	.00	5.08	23.73	32.20	37.29	1.69
D	.00	2.38	30.95	50.00	16.67	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Teacher use of school libraries (especially relationships between recency of educational preparation and use, subjects taught and use, etc.)
G-7

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	2.96	13.61	32.54	49.70	.59
A	.00	5.56	5.56	27.78	61.10	.00
B	.00	3.13	18.75	28.13	50.00	.00
C	1.69	3.39	13.56	30.51	49.15	1.69
D	.00	.00	16.67	42.86	40.48	.00

QUESTION: Administrators' use of school libraries
G-8

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	13.02	30.18	29.59	21.89	1.78
A	2.78	13.89	16.67	41.67	22.22	2.78
B	.00	12.50	28.13	28.13	31.25	.00
C	3.39	11.86	33.90	18.64	28.81	2.29
D	7.14	14.29	38.10	35.71	4.76	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Advantages/disadvantages of a library-study hall combination
G-9

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	7.69	23.67	23.67	17.16	24.26	3.55
A	11.11	33.33	25.00	13.89	13.89	2.78
B	.00	9.38	18.75	21.88	46.88	3.13
C	8.47	18.64	23.73	22.03	25.42	1.69
D	9.52	33.33	26.19	9.52	14.29	7.14

QUESTION: Effect of centralized libraries in all levels of schools
G-10 on teacher/pupil use

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	2.96	12.43	31.36	50.30	1.18
A	.00	2.78	5.56	38.89	50.00	2.78
B	.00	6.25	12.50	37.50	43.75	.00
C	.00	1.69	8.47	16.95	72.88	.00
D	7.14	2.38	23.81	40.48	23.81	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Effect of individualized reading programs on pupils' attitudes toward the library
G-11

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	3.55	24.26	39.05	31.95	.59
A	.00	2.78	30.56	33.33	33.33	.00
B	.00	3.13	18.75	40.63	37.50	.00
C	1.69	1.69	27.12	40.68	28.81	.00
D	.00	7.14	19.05	40.48	30.95	2.38

QUESTION: Attitudes of librarians toward the teaching function and the information service function, and their possible conflicts
G-12

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	5.92	26.04	31.95	32.54	2.37
A	.00	5.56	27.78	47.22	19.44	.00
B	.00	6.25	25.00	28.13	37.50	3.13
C	3.39	3.39	27.12	23.73	38.98	3.39
D	.00	9.52	23.81	33.33	30.95	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Centralized services at local, county, state and regional levels
H-1

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	2.96	13.61	28.40	53.25	1.18
A	.00	.00	13.89	16.67	66.67	2.78
B	.00	12.50	15.63	40.63	31.25	.00
C	.00	.00	8.47	28.81	62.71	.00
D	2.38	2.38	19.05	28.57	45.24	2.38

QUESTION: Use of book jobbers in acquiring materials
H-2

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	6.51	12.43	47.34	24.85	7.69	1.18
A	8.33	13.89	38.89	22.22	13.89	2.78
B	.00	15.63	53.13	28.13	3.13	.00
C	5.08	10.17	45.76	28.81	10.17	.00
D	11.90	11.90	52.38	19.05	2.38	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Problems of purchasing and using printed catalog cards
H-3

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	15.38	37.28	28.40	13.02	2.37
A	5.56	13.89	30.56	30.56	19.44	.00
B	.00	15.63	37.50	31.25	15.63	.00
C	1.69	15.25	35.59	35.59	10.17	1.69
D	7.14	16.67	45.24	14.29	9.52	7.14

QUESTION: Use of commercial processors by school libraries
H-4

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	6.51	34.32	33.73	21.89	1.18
A	2.78	2.78	27.78	30.56	36.11	.00
B	.00	12.50	40.63	31.25	15.63	.00
C	.00	5.08	28.81	42.37	23.73	.00
D	7.14	7.14	42.86	26.19	11.90	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Problems in the care of books (mending, binding, housing, etc.)
H-5

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	11.83	39.05	36.09	7.69	2.96	2.37
A	11.11	52.78	27.78	2.78	2.78	2.78
B	.00	31.25	40.63	21.88	6.25	.00
C	10.17	42.37	37.29	6.78	3.39	.00
D	23.81	28.57	38.10	2.38	.00	7.14

QUESTION: Problems in the acquisition and care of periodicals
H-6 (storage, binding, microfilming, etc.)

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	17.16	35.50	31.95	11.83	1.18
A	2.78	16.67	44.44	19.44	16.67	.00
B	.00	15.63	25.00	40.63	18.75	.00
C	1.69	16.95	35.59	33.90	11.86	.00
D	4.76	19.05	35.71	33.33	2.38	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Evaluating circulation methods
H-7

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	5.33	24.85	43.79	17.75	6.51	1.78
A	5.56	25.00	38.89	22.22	5.56	2.78
B	3.13	15.63	37.50	37.50	6.25	.00
C	5.08	28.81	52.54	8.47	5.08	.00
D	7.14	26.19	40.48	11.90	9.52	4.76

QUESTION: Use of automation in the various phases of library operations
H-8

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	10.06	21.30	30.18	36.69	1.18
A	.00	5.56	16.67	27.78	47.22	2.78
B	.00	15.63	37.50	28.13	18.75	.00
C	1.69	10.17	18.64	28.18	40.68	.00
D	.00	9.52	16.67	35.71	35.71	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Methods, problems, and costs of organizing, cataloging, storing,
H-9 and circulating ausio-visual materials (including repair)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	3.55	18.34	33.73	42.60	1.18
A	.00	2.78	19.44	27.78	50.00	.00
B	.00	3.13	18.75	37.50	40.63	.00
C	.00	3.39	13.56	32.20	50.85	.00
D	2.38	4.76	23.81	38.10	26.19	4.76

QUESTION: Study of the use of the catalog, including effectiveness of
H-10 simplified catalog cards

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	11.83	34.91	31.36	19.53	.59
A	5.56	5.56	30.56	36.11	22.22	.00
B	.00	12.50	15.63	40.63	31.25	.00
C	1.69	10.17	45.67	23.73	18.64	.00
D	.00	19.05	38.10	30.95	9.52	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, impertance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Which system of classification and arrangement is most
H-11 effective and useful (Dewey, L.C., "Interest", Other?)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	7.10	22.49	27.81	21.89	18.93	1.78
A	5.56	22.22	33.33	19.44	19.44	.00
B	.00	6.25	31.25	40.63	21.88	.00
C	8.47	22.03	27.12	20.34	22.03	.00
D	11.90	35.71	21.43	11.90	11.90	7.14

QUESTION: Studies of technical processes (including workplace,
H-12 process charts, time and motion)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	10.65	42.01	26.63	15.98	1.18
A	2.78	11.11	33.33	27.78	22.22	2.78
B	.00	3.13	40.63	37.50	18.75	.00
C	6.78	10.17	35.59	30.51	16.95	.00
D	2.38	16.67	59.52	11.90	7.14	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Administrators' attitudes toward school libraries
I-1

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	1.78	13.61	30.77	52.07	1.18
A	.00	2.78	8.33	25.00	61.11	2.78
B	.00	.00	.00	28.13	71.88	.00
C	.00	3.39	15.25	28.81	52.54	.00
D	2.38	.00	23.81	38.10	33.00	2.38

QUESTION: Teachers' attitudes toward school libraries
I-2

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	1.78	11.24	32.54	52.44	1.18
A	.00	2.78	8.33	25.00	61.11	2.78
B	.00	.00	6.25	18.75	75.00	.00
C	.00	1.69	11.86	40.68	45.76	.00
D	2.38	2.38	16.67	38.10	38.10	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Community attitudes toward school libraries
I-3

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	4.73	30.77	34.91	28.40	1.18
A	.00	5.56	27.78	30.56	33.33	2.78
B	.00	3.13	28.13	25.00	43.75	.00
C	.00	3.39	27.12	42.37	27.12	.00
D	.00	7.14	40.48	35.71	14.29	2.38

QUESTION: Non-school librarians' attitudes toward school libraries
I-4 and school librarians

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	14.20	27.81	30.77	22.49	2.96
A	.00	16.67	30.56	27.78	19.44	5.56
B	.00	9.38	28.13	31.25	31.25	.00
C	1.69	15.25	28.81	28.81	25.42	.00
D	4.76	14.29	23.81	35.71	14.29	7.14

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Examination of school library publicity methods
I-5

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.14	18.34	42.60	24.26	7.10	3.55
A	.00	25.00	41.67	22.22	5.56	5.56
B	.00	3.13	59.38	21.88	15.63	.00
C	5.08	20.34	42.37	23.73	5.08	3.39
D	9.52	21.34	30.95	28.57	4.76	4.76

QUESTION: Students' attitudes toward school libraries
I-6

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	2.37	16.57	33.73	44.38	1.78
A	.00	2.78	16.67	30.56	47.22	2.78
B	.00	6.25	12.50	15.63	65.63	.00
C	.00	1.69	16.95	38.98	40.68	1.69
D	4.76	.00	19.05	42.86	30.95	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Role of the school library and librarian in guidance
J-1

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	6.51	35.50	33.14	20.71	2.37
A	2.78	5.56	38.89	33.33	16.67	2.78
B	.00	6.25	25.00	28.13	40.63	.00
C	1.69	5.08	38.98	33.90	16.95	3.39
D	2.38	9.52	35.71	35.71	14.29	2.38

QUESTION: Effectiveness of the library in providing occupational information
J-2

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	10.06	42.60	30.77	12.43	2.37
A	.00	11.11	50.00	33.33	2.78	2.78
B	.00	3.13	40.63	25.00	31.25	.00
C	.00	11.86	44.07	30.51	11.86	1.69
D	7.14	11.90	35.71	33.33	7.14	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Effectiveness of the library in providing information for
J-3 the college-bound

Group	1*	2	Percentages 3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	10.06	42.60	27.81	14.79	2.96
A	.00	8.33	55.56	25.00	5.56	5.56
B	.00	3.13	31.25	28.13	37.50	.00
C	.00	10.17	45.76	28.81	13.56	1.69
D	7.14	16.67	35.71	28.57	7.14	4.76

QUESTION: Relationships between the school library and the guidance
J-4 department

Group	1*	2	Percentages 3	4	5	6
ALL	2.37	6.51	45.56	29.59	13.61	2.37
A	2.78	5.56	52.78	27.78	8.33	2.78
B	.00	3.13	40.63	28.13	28.13	.00
C	1.69	3.39	50.85	27.12	13.56	3.39
D	4.76	14.29	35.71	35.71	7.14	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: J-5 Personal guidance through books: what role for the school librarian?

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	8.28	36.09	32.54	20.12	1.78
A	2.78	8.33	36.11	36.11	13.89	2.78
B	.00	3.13	31.25	28.13	37.50	.00
C	1.69	8.47	42.37	27.12	18.64	1.69
D	.00	11.90	30.95	40.48	14.29	2.38

QUESTION: K-1 Efficacy of various programs of library instruction for pupils (formal instruction, instruction integrated with teaching units, library orientation, etc.)

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.96	15.38	30.77	49.11	1.78
A	.00	2.78	5.56	33.33	55.56	2.78
B	.00	3.13	6.25	37.50	53.13	.00
C	.00	1.69	16.95	25.42	55.93	.00
D	.00	4.76	28.57	30.95	30.95	4.76

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Articulation of library instruction at all levels
K-2

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	1.78	23.08	39.05	34.32	1.18
A	.00	2.78	19.44	47.22	27.78	2.78
B	.00	3.13	12.50	31.25	53.13	.00
C	1.69	.00	28.81	35.59	33.90	.00
D	.00	2.38	26.19	42.86	26.19	2.38

QUESTION: Integrated use of reference materials in the instructional program of the school
K-3

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.96	20.12	33.14	40.83	2.96
A	.00	8.33	16.67	33.33	36.11	5.56
B	.00	.00	18.75	18.75	62.50	.00
C	.00	.00	22.03	35.59	38.98	3.39
D	.00	4.76	21.43	40.48	30.95	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Effectiveness of various teaching techniques and devices
K-4

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	1.78	27.22	32.54	34.32	3.55
A	.00	5.56	25.00	25.00	38.89	5.56
B	3.13	.00	21.88	37.50	31.25	6.25
C	.00	.00	30.51	28.81	40.68	.00
D	.00	2.38	28.57	40.48	23.81	4.76

QUESTION: Role of state departments of education in school library
L-1 improvement

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	2.96	24.26	29.59	37.87	3.55
A	.00	2.78	36.11	19.44	36.11	5.56
B	3.13	.00	15.63	34.38	43.75	3.13
C	.00	1.69	16.95	30.51	50.85	.00
D	4.76	7.14	30.95	33.33	16.67	7.14

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Role of regional accrediting (and other) associations in
L-2 school library improvement

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	6.51	28.99	31.95	28.99	2.96
A	.00	8.33	33.33	25.00	30.56	2.78
B	.00	6.25	21.88	31.25	37.50	3.13
C	.00	1.69	30.51	37.29	30.51	.00
D	2.38	11.90	28.57	30.95	19.05	7.14

QUESTION: Role of library and education associations in school
L-3 library improvement

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	4.73	30.77	34.32	25.44	3.55
A	.00	11.11	36.11	30.56	16.67	5.56
B	.00	.00	28.13	34.38	34.38	3.13
C	.00	1.69	27.12	38.98	32.20	.00
D	4.76	7.14	33.33	30.95	16.67	7.14

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Effects of state aids on local school libraries
L-4

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	6.51	30.77	34.32	22.49	4.73
A	.00	16.67	30.56	27.78	16.67	8.33
B	.00	6.25	15.63	46.88	28.13	3.13
C	3.39	1.69	28.81	33.90	30.51	1.69
D	.00	4.76	45.24	30.95	11.90	7.14

QUESTION: Effects of federal aids on local school libraries
L-5

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	1.18	18.93	33.73	42.01	3.55
A	.00	5.56	19.44	33.33	36.11	5.56
B	.00	.00	12.50	40.63	43.75	3.13
C	1.69	.00	15.25	32.20	50.85	.00
D	.00	.00	28.57	30.95	33.33	7.14

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: L-6 Survey of school library aid programs on the state and federal levels

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	5.92	27.81	27.81	33.14	4.73
A	.00	11.11	22.22	25.00	36.11	5.56
B	.00	.00	25.00	46.88	25.00	3.13
C	.00	3.39	27.12	27.12	38.98	3.39
D	2.38	9.52	35.71	16.67	28.57	7.14

QUESTION: M-1 Development of a national pattern for the gathering of uniform library statistics at the state and local levels

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.96	5.92	28.40	21.30	35.50	5.92
A	.00	5.56	25.00	13.89	47.22	8.33
B	.00	3.13	37.50	21.88	28.13	9.38
C	1.69	1.69	27.12	27.12	40.68	1.69
D	9.52	14.29	26.19	19.05	23.81	7.14

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Gathering, use and effectiveness of statistics in local school
M-2 libraries

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	13.02	33.73	29.59	18.34	4.73
A	.00	13.89	27.78	27.78	25.00	5.56
B	.00	6.25	43.75	21.88	18.75	9.38
C	.00	6.78	35.59	35.59	22.03	.00
D	2.38	26.19	28.57	28.57	7.14	7.14

QUESTION: State requirements and patterns in gathering statistics and
M-3 other information about local school libraries

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	13.02	37.28	25.44	15.98	6.51
A	.00	13.89	30.56	27.78	19.44	8.33
B	.00	6.25	56.25	25.00	3.13	9.38
C	1.69	8.47	40.68	22.03	27.12	.00
D	4.76	23.81	23.81	28.57	7.14	11.90

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Effectiveness of various methods of studying school libraries (use studies, cost studies, evaluative methods, attitude, etc.)
M-4

Group	1*	2	Percentages 3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	5.33	33.14	31.95	26.63	2.96
A	.00	8.33	19.44	30.56	38.89	2.78
B	.00	3.13	56.25	25.00	6.25	9.38
C	.00	5.08	25.42	35.59	33.90	.00
D	.00	4.76	38.10	33.33	21.43	2.38

QUESTION: Role of the library in team teaching
N-1

Group	1*	2	Percentages 3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	1.78	22.49	36.09	39.05	.00
A	.00	.00	27.78	33.33	28.89	.00
B	3.13	3.13	12.50	31.25	50.00	.00
C	.00	1.69	23.73	35.59	38.98	.00
D	.00	2.38	23.81	42.86	30.95	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Effect of advanced placement programs on the library
N-2

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	3.55	35.50	36.09	23.08	1.18
A	.00	.00	41.67	36.11	19.44	2.78
B	.00	6.25	28.13	28.13	37.50	.00
C	1.69	1.69	35.59	40.68	18.64	1.69
D	.00	7.14	35.71	35.71	21.43	.00

QUESTION: Role of the library in programs for the mentally handicapped
N-3

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	11.24	35.50	36.69	15.38	1.18
A	.00	13.89	36.11	33.33	13.89	2.78
B	.00	12.50	28.13	37.50	21.88	.00
C	.00	8.47	42.37	32.20	15.25	1.69
D	.00	11.90	30.95	45.24	11.90	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Library orientation practices for teachers (especially new teachers)
N-4

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	5.92	28.99	25.44	38.46	1.18
A	.00	8.33	33.33	22.22	36.11	.00
B	.00	.00	12.50	28.13	59.38	.00
C	.00	8.47	25.42	30.51	32.20	3.39
D	.00	4.76	42.86	19.05	33.33	.00

QUESTION: Role of the library in programmed/automated instruction
N-5

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	5.92	34.32	28.40	30.18	.59
A	.00	13.89	27.78	30.56	25.00	2.78
B	.00	3.13	31.25	21.88	43.75	.00
C	1.69	3.39	40.68	27.12	27.12	.00
D	.00	4.76	33.33	33.33	28.57	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Library programs for the non-library oriented subject areas
N-6

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	8.88	33.73	34.32	18.34	2.96
A	.00	5.56	41.67	33.33	19.44	.00
B	3.13	6.25	25.00	40.63	21.88	3.13
C	.00	10.17	32.20	33.90	16.95	6.78
D	4.76	11.90	35.71	30.95	16.67	.00

QUESTION: Role of the library in programs for the culturally deprived
N-7

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	4.14	26.63	42.01	26.04	1.18
A	.00	2.78	22.22	47.22	27.78	.00
B	.00	9.38	21.88	25.00	40.63	3.13
C	.00	1.69	32.20	45.76	20.34	.00
D	.00	4.76	26.19	45.24	21.43	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Student reading (Why?Areas?Sources of materials?Effect
N-8 of school library)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.37	24.26	39.64	31.95	1.78
A	.00	.00	25.00	36.11	38.89	.00
B	.00	3.13	15.63	40.63	37.50	3.13
C	.00	3.39	30.51	38.98	27.12	.00
D	.00	2.38	21.43	42.86	28.57	4.76

QUESTION: Influence of the school librarian on local curriculum
N-9 development

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	1.18	24.26	36.69	36.69	1.18
A	.00	.00	16.67	36.11	47.22	.00
B	.00	.00	18.75	31.25	46.88	3.13
C	.00	1.69	28.81	40.68	27.12	1.69
D	.00	2.38	28.57	35.71	33.33	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: N-10 Functions of the library in programs of reading instruction

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.96	24.26	37.87	34.32	.59
A	.00	5.56	16.67	41.67	36.11	.00
B	.00	.00	9.38	25.00	62.50	3.13
C	.00	3.39	33.90	37.29	25.42	.00
D	.00	2.38	28.57	45.24	23.81	.00

QUESTION: N-11 Study of the services requested by teachers and students, and effective provision of such services

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	2.37	20.71	44.38	30.18	1.18
A	.00	.00	22.22	50.00	27.78	.00
B	.00	.00	21.88	28.13	46.88	3.13
C	.00	5.08	15.25	50.85	17.12	1.69
D	4.76	2.38	26.19	42.86	23.81	.00

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: The school library in teacher education (teacher-training institutions)
N-12

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	.59	10.65	28.99	57.99	1.18
A	.00	.00	16.67	25.00	58.33	.00
B	.00	.00	9.38	25.00	65.63	.00
C	.00	.00	8.47	35.59	54.24	1.69
D	2.38	2.38	9.52	26.19	57.14	2.38

QUESTION: Library programs for the gifted
N-13

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	5.33	34.32	37.28	21.30	1.78
A	.00	5.56	41.67	38.89	13.89	.00
B	.00	6.25	28.13	28.13	37.50	.00
C	.00	3.39	37.29	37.29	18.64	3.39
D	.00	7.14	28.57	42.86	19.05	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Location of the library within the school
O-1

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.14	14.79	37.87	24.85	16.57	1.78
A	2.78	25.00	38.89	19.44	11.11	2.78
B	3.13	9.38	15.63	37.50	34.38	.00
C	.00	11.86	47.46	23.73	16.95	.00
D	11.90	14.29	40.48	21.43	7.14	4.76

QUESTION: The school library as housed in a separate building
O-2

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.14	20.12	39.64	21.30	10.06	4.73
A	5.56	22.22	44.44	16.67	5.56	5.56
B	.00	25.00	25.00	28.13	18.75	3.13
C	1.69	15.25	47.46	20.34	11.86	3.39
D	9.52	21.43	35.71	21.43	4.76	7.14

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Effective internal arrangement of facilities and equipment
0-3

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	10.65	36.09	28.99	20.12	2.37
A	.00	13.89	41.67	22.22	19.44	2.78
B	.00	6.25	18.75	40.63	34.38	.00
C	1.69	8.47	40.68	23.73	22.03	3.39
D	4.76	14.29	38.10	33.33	7.14	2.38

QUESTION: Study of facilities in a school library
0-4

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	9.47	39.64	30.77	14.20	4.14
A	.00	11.11	44.44	25.00	13.89	5.56
B	.00	9.38	25.00	31.25	34.38	.00
C	.00	8.47	38.98	38.98	10.17	3.39
D	7.14	9.52	47.62	23.81	4.76	7.14

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Comparative costs, efficiency and life of school library equipment
0-5

Group	1*	2	3	4	5	6
	Percentages					
ALL	1.78	18.93	39.05	23.08	14.79	2.37
A	.00	33.33	19.44	22.22	22.22	2.78
B	.00	3.13	37.50	40.63	18.75	.00
C	3.39	15.25	47.46	18.64	13.56	1.69
D	2.38	23.81	45.24	16.67	7.14	4.76

QUESTION: Determination of the desirable seating capacity in various size schools
0-6

Group	1*	2	3	4	5	6
	Percentages					
ALL	3.55	14.79	40.83	23.08	13.02	4.73
A	2.78	19.44	33.33	16.67	25.00	2.78
B	.00	3.13	37.50	34.38	25.00	.00
C	1.69	10.17	50.85	25.42	6.78	5.08
D	9.52	26.19	35.11	16.67	2.38	9.52

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: 0-7 Study of the effective use, housing, and equipment of audio-stations, listening booths, listening rooms, electronic carrels, and study carrels

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	2.37	19.53	31.95	44.97	1.18
A	.00	.00	19.44	16.67	61.11	2.78
B	.00	6.25	15.63	31.25	46.88	.00
C	.00	.00	18.64	32.20	49.15	.00
D	.00	4.76	23.81	45.24	23.81	2.38

QUESTION: 0-8 Effective methods of organizing and housing special collections (college catalogs, maps, pictures, charts, etc.)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.73	11.83	34.32	27.81	19.53	1.78
A	2.78	16.67	30.56	25.00	22.22	2.78
B	.00	6.25	21.88	43.75	25.00	3.13
C	3.39	13.56	44.07	18.64	20.34	.00
D	11.90	9.52	33.33	30.95	11.90	2.38

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Librarian's role in planning new libraries or remodeling
0-9 old libraries

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	4.73	15.98	36.69	37.87	2.96
A	.00	5.56	27.78	22.22	41.67	2.78
B	.00	.00	6.25	37.50	53.13	3.13
C	.00	1.69	18.64	40.68	37.29	1.69
D	7.14	11.90	9.52	42.86	23.81	4.76

QUESTION: Relationships of school and public library service
P-1 (distinctive functions and areas of cooperation)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	4.73	21.30	36.09	34.91	1.18
A	.00	5.56	27.78	38.89	25.00	2.78
B	.00	6.25	18.75	43.75	31.25	.00
C	1.69	1.69	18.64	27.12	50.85	.00
D	4.76	7.14	21.43	40.48	23.81	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Interlibrary loan practices (individual pupil's requests
P-2 and teachers' requests for class use)

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	4.73	10.06	47.34	28.99	7.10	1.78
A	2.78	11.11	50.00	16.67	13.89	5.56
B	.00	9.38	40.63	46.88	3.13	.00
C	1.69	11.86	42.37	33.90	10.17	.00
D	14.29	7.14	57.14	19.05	.00	2.38

QUESTION: Role of public library service to schools in improving/
P-3 retarding school library development

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	2.96	8.88	30.18	34.91	21.89	1.18
A	2.78	13.89	27.78	33.33	19.44	2.78
B	.00	9.38	31.25	46.88	9.38	3.13
C	.00	3.39	30.51	30.51	35.59	.00
D	9.52	11.90	30.95	33.33	14.29	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Advantages/disadvantages of the school-housed public library
P-4

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	10.06	19.53	35.50	14.20	18.93	1.78
A	5.56	22.22	27.78	22.22	16.67	5.56
B	3.13	31.25	43.75	9.38	12.50	.00
C	10.17	6.78	35.59	15.25	32.20	.00
D	19.05	26.19	35.71	9.52	7.14	2.38

QUESTION: Relations of the school librarian and teachers with the public librarians
P-5

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	7.10	40.83	35.50	12.43	2.37
A	2.78	13.89	33.33	38.89	8.33	2.78
B	.00	3.13	53.13	34.38	9.38	.00
C	1.69	3.39	37.29	33.90	23.73	.00
D	2.38	9.52	42.86	35.71	2.38	7.14

---

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: P-6 Relationships of student use of school, public and collegiate libraries and effects

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	7.10	39.05	33.73	17.75	1.78
A	.00	11.11	38.89	33.33	13.89	2.78
B	.00	9.38	34.38	37.50	18.75	.00
C	1.69	.00	38.98	33.90	25.42	.00
D	.00	11.90	42.86	30.95	9.52	4.76

QUESTION: Q-1 Teacher's role in selection (and educational preparation of teachers in selection)

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	1.18	20.71	41.42	35.50	1.18
A	.00	.00	19.44	30.56	50.00	.00
B	.00	3.13	25.00	40.63	31.25	.00
C	.00	1.69	20.34	44.07	30.51	3.39
D	.00	.00	19.05	47.62	33.33	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Administrator's role in selection
Q-2

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	8.88	38.46	31.36	17.75	1.78
A	5.56	13.89	25.00	27.78	25.00	2.78
B	.00	6.25	56.25	28.13	9.38	.00
C	.00	8.47	32.20	35.59	20.34	3.39
D	2.38	7.14	45.24	30.95	14.29	.00

QUESTION: Censorship in school libraries by non-school groups or individuals
Q-3

Group			Percentages			
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	3.55	5.92	29.59	32.54	26.63	1.78
A	5.56	.00	36.11	30.56	27.78	.00
B	6.25	15.63	25.00	18.75	31.25	3.13
C	3.39	1.69	22.03	40.68	30.51	1.69
D	.00	9.52	38.10	33.33	16.67	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Internal censorship by librarians or other school personnel
Q-4

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	4.14	26.04	39.64	26.63	1.78
A	5.56	5.56	22.22	38.89	25.00	2.78
B	3.13	3.13	31.25	34.38	28.13	.00
C	.00	3.39	25.42	38.98	30.51	1.69
D	.00	4.76	26.19	45.24	21.43	2.38

QUESTION: Role of professional organizations in combating censorship
Q-5

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	7.69	35.50	39.05	14.20	2.37
A	.00	13.89	30.56	47.22	8.33	.00
B	.00	6.25	31.25	37.50	25.00	.00
C	1.69	6.78	38.98	35.59	11.86	5.08
D	2.38	4.76	38.10	38.10	14.29	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Problems of centralized selection of materials
Q-6

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.78	10.06	30.18	33.14	21.89	2.96
A	.00	13.89	22.22	38.89	22.22	2.78
B	.00	12.50	25.00	37.50	25.00	.00
C	1.69	5.08	28.81	32.30	25.42	6.78
D	4.76	11.90	42.86	26.10	14.29	.00

QUESTION: Effectiveness of book selection committees
Q-7

Group	Percentages 1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.59	5.33	40.83	31.36	20.12	1.78
A	2.78	2.78	36.11	27.78	27.78	2.78
B	.00	3.13	40.63	43.75	12.50	.00
C	.00	5.08	44.07	23.73	23.73	3.39
D	.00	9.52	40.48	35.71	14.29	.00

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

TABLES OF PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

QUESTION: Use and effectiveness of book selection policies
Q-8

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	.00	3.55	21.30	39.64	34.91	.59
A	.00	.00	27.78	30.56	41.67	.00
B	.00	.00	21.88	43.75	34.38	.00
C	.00	1.69	22.03	33.90	40.68	1.69
D	.00	11.90	14.29	52.38	21.43	.00

QUESTION: Practices and problems of student participation in selection
Q-9

Group	Percentages					
	1*	2	3	4	5	6
ALL	1.18	17.16	42.01	25.44	11.83	2.37
A	2.78	22.22	36.11	11.11	25.00	2.78
B	.00	12.50	43.75	34.38	9.38	.00
C	.00	8.47	47.46	30.51	10.17	3.39
D	2.38	28.57	38.10	23.81	4.76	2.38

* 1, unimportant; 2, of limited importance; 3, importance; 4, very important; 5, absolutely essential; 6, undecided.

In addition to the percentages, the means and grand means of the questions and the areas are of interest. On the following pages may be found (1) a table of the grand means of each area, giving the grand mean for each area of the questionnaire for all the groups and for each group, and (2) tables of means for each question or statement in each area for all groups and for each group. Frequency tables may be found in Appendix D.

GRAND MEANS FOR EACH OF THE AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH

Area of * Research	All Groups	Subgroup A **	Subgroup B	Subgroup C	Subgroup D
A	3.68	3.61	3.81	3.63	3.70
B	3.67	3.61	3.90	3.67	3.55
C	3.62	3.52	3.83	3.69	3.44
D	3.66	3.66	3.92	3.65	2.46
E	3.44	3.43	3.75	3.45	3.22
F	3.78	3.70	4.16	3.79	3.53
G	3.90	3.94	4.06	3.91	4.04
H	3.46	3.55	3.59	3.51	3.21
I	3.91	3.95	4.20	3.90	3.68
J	3.52	3.40	3.93	3.50	3.34
K	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.16	3.94
L	3.92	3.79	4.10	4.09	3.63
M	3.66	3.85	3.52	3.85	3.33
N	3.93	3.92	4.14	3.88	3.85
O	3.54	3.52	3.93	3.57	3.19
P	3.52	3.46	3.52	3.78	3.19
Q	3.72	3.75	3.72	3.81	3.59

---

* To identify the Areas of Research, see Appendix A

** Subgroup A, officers and directors of American Association of School Librarians; Subgroup B, presidents of state and regional school library associations; Subgroup C, state school library supervisors; Subgroup D, library educators.

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question *	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A** Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
A-1	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.61
A-2	4.64	4.86	4.73	4.56	4.51
A-3	2.29	2.11	2.37	2.15	2.56
A-4	3.04	2.74	3.29	3.04	3.12
A-5	4.28	4.40	4.56	4.21	4.07
A-6	3.17	2.91	3.24	3.16	3.35
Grand Mean, Area A	3.68	3.61	3.81	3.63	3.70
B-1	2.35	2.29	2.53	2.25	2.40
B-2	3.66	3.59	4.13	3.59	3.47
B-3	3.50	3.50	3.75	3.33	3.55
B-4	3.98	4.00	4.16	3.93	3.88
B-5	3.85	3.50	4.31	3.97	3.57
B-6	4.02	3.85	4.28	4.16	3.76
B-7	4.39	4.54	4.16	4.51	4.27
Grand Mean, Area B	3.67	3.61	3.90	3.67	3.55
C-1	3.23	3.35	3.59	3.04	3.15
C-2	3.61	3.53	3.76	3.71	3.43
C-3	3.70	3.66	3.63	3.90	3.49
C-4	3.77	3.53	4.48	3.66	3.61

* To identify the questions, see Appendix A

** To identify the subgroups, see page 96.

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
C-5	2.97	2.79	3.24	3.05	2.80
C-6	3.42	3.06	4.13	3.38	3.24
C-7	4.32	4.33	4.39	4.39	4.17
C-8	5.11	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.22
C-9	3.96	3.92	4.06	4.09	3.73
C-10	3.85	3.63	3.97	4.17	3.49
C-11	3.19	3.21	3.29	3.24	3.03
C-12	3.33	3.14	3.52	3.58	3.02
Grand Mean, Area C	3.62	3.52	3.83	3.69	3.44
D-1	3.87	3.80	4.28	3.93	3.50
D-2	4.25	4.20	4.44	4.26	4.14
D-3	3.58	3.74	3.66	3.55	3.44
D-4	3.99	3.94	4.03	3.95	4.05
D-5	3.59	3.43	3.91	3.68	3.38
D-6	3.31	3.34	3.88	3.02	3.23
D-7	3.43	3.43	3.84	3.19	3.44
D-8	3.42	3.26	4.19	3.25	3.20
D-9	3.82	3.82	3.88	3.88	3.70
D-10	3.68	3.58	4.38	3.61	3.31
D-11	4.35	4.61	4.52	4.36	3.95
D-12	2.80	2.75	3.19	2.74	2.60

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
D-13	2.88	2.77	3.39	2.85	2.60
D-14	3.82	3.83	3.90	3.88	3.64
D-15	3.83	3.74	4.03	3.93	3.61
D-16	2.91	2.59	3.26	2.84	3.00
D-17	3.74	3.86	3.90	3.84	3.36
D-18	3.68	3.94	3.81	3.76	3.27
D-19	4.08	4.03	4.13	4.07	4.10
D-20	3.88	3.91	4.03	3.93	3.68
D-21	3.92	4.03	4.13	3.92	3.66
D-22	3.89	3.77	4.06	4.12	3.52
D-23	3.47	3.37	3.90	3.51	3.15
D-24	3.81	4.03	3.77	3.84	3.60
D-25	3.61	3.72	3.52	3.52	3.11
D-26	3.42	3.41	4.06	3.29	3.12
D-27	3.83	3.94	3.90	3.86	3.63
D-28	3.70	3.77	3.90	3.66	3.56
Grand Mean, Area D	3.66	3.66	3.92	3.65	3.46
E-1	2.65	2.47	3.09	2.68	2.42
E-2	3.59	3.25	3.84	3.85	3.33
E-3	3.79	3.67	4.19	3.78	3.60
E-4	4.10	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.88
E-5	3.91	3.92	4.06	3.95	3.74

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
E-6	4.27	4.31	4.19	4.33	4.21
E-7	3.39	3.39	3.75	3.40	3.08
E-8	4.34	4.39	4.56	4.49	3.93
E-9	3.58	3.62	3.88	3.48	3.48
E-10	3.20	3.09	3.77	3.12	3.00
E-11	3.11	2.86	3.61	3.07	3.00
E-12	2.72	2.86	3.03	2.65	2.45
E-13	2.82	2.83	3.16	2.80	2.59
E-14	3.35	3.53	3.59	3.36	2.98
E-15	2.89	3.08	3.31	2.69	2.68
Grand Mean, Area E	3.44	3.43	3.75	3.45	3.22
F-1	4.07	4.23	4.47	3.98	3.75
F-2	3.86	3.80	4.28	3.78	3.70
F-3	3.43	3.15	3.84	3.53	3.20
F-4	3.42	3.35	3.78	3.44	3.15
F-5	3.78	3.44	4.28	3.86	3.54
F-6	4.15	4.23	4.34	4.20	3.85
Grand Mean, Area F	3.76	3.70	4.16	3.79	3.53
G-1	4.06	4.19	4.19	4.02	3.90
G-2	4.23	4.33	4.22	4.10	4.31
G-3	3.59	3.65	3.78	3.67	3.27

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
G-4	3.49	3.71	3.88	3.30	3.27
G-5	4.21	4.25	4.31	4.17	4.14
G-6	3.96	4.03	3.94	4.03	3.81
G-7	4.29	4.44	4.25	4.24	4.24
G-8	3.54	3.69	3.78	3.60	3.17
G-9	3.28	2.86	4.10	3.38	2.85
G-10	4.27	4.40	4.19	4.61	3.73
G-11	3.99	3.97	4.13	3.93	3.98
G-12	3.91	3.81	4.00	3.95	3.88
Grand Mean, Area G	3.90	3.94	4.06	3.91	4.04
H-1	4.32	4.54	3.91	4.54	4.15
H-2	3.15	3.20	3.19	3.29	2.88
H-3	3.33	3.44	3.47	3.38	3.03
H-4	3.67	3.94	3.50	3.85	3.30
H-5	2.50	2.31	3.03	2.51	2.21
H-6	3.34	3.31	3.63	3.37	3.10
H-7	2.95	2.97	3.28	2.80	2.90
H-8	3.93	4.20	3.50	3.97	4.00
H-9	4.16	4.25	4.16	4.31	3.85

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
H-10	3.55	3.64	3.91	3.47	3.32
H-11	3.23	3.25	3.78	3.25	2.74
H-12	3.41	3.57	3.72	3.41	3.05
Grand Mean, Area H	3.46	3.55	3.59	3.51	3.21
I-1	4.34	4.40	4.72	4.31	4.02
I-2	4.37	4.49	4.69	4.31	4.10
I-3	3.88	3.94	4.09	3.93	3.59
I-4	3.60	3.53	3.84	3.61	3.44
I-5	3.12	3.09	3.50	3.04	2.97
I-6	4.20	4.26	4.41	4.21	3.98
Grand Mean, Area I	3.91	3.95	4.20	3.90	3.68
J-1	3.66	3.57	4.03	3.61	3.51
J-2	3.43	3.29	3.84	3.43	3.22
J-3	3.45	3.29	4.00	3.47	3.13
J-4	3.47	3.34	3.81	3.49	3.27
J-5	3.63	3.51	4.00	3.53	3.59
Grand Mean, Area J	3.52	3.40	3.93	3.50	3.34
K-1	4.28	4.46	4.41	4.36	3.92
K-2	4.06	4.03	4.34	4.00	3.95
K-3	4.15	4.03	4.44	4.18	4.00

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
K-4	4.02	4.03	4.00	4.10	3.90
Grand Mean, Area K	4.12	4.13	4.29	4.16	3.94
L-1	4.02	3.94	4.19	4.31	3.54
L-2	3.85	3.80	4.03	3.97	3.54
L-3	3.81	3.56	4.06	4.02	3.51
L-4	3.74	3.48	4.00	3.88	3.54
L-5	4.20	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.05
L-6	3.91	3.91	4.00	4.05	3.64
Grand Mean, Area L	3.92	3.79	4.10	4.09	3.63
M-1	3.86	4.12	3.83	4.05	3.36
M-2	3.55	3.68	3.59	3.73	3.13
M-3	3.44	3.58	3.28	3.64	3.11
M-4	3.82	4.03	3.38	3.98	3.73
Grand Mean, Area M	3.66	3.85	3.52	3.85	3.33
N-1	4.11	4.11	4.22	4.12	4.02
N-2	3.78	3.77	3.97	3.74	3.71
N-3	3.57	3.49	3.69	3.55	3.57
N-4	3.98	3.86	4.47	3.89	3.81
N-5	3.82	3.69	4.06	3.75	3.86
N-6	3.60	3.67	3.74	3.62	3.43

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
N-7	3.91	4.00	4.00	3.85	3.85
N-8	4.03	4.14	4.16	3.90	4.03
N-9	4.10	4.31	3.29	3.95	4.00
N-10	4.04	4.08	4.55	3.85	3.90
N-11	4.01	4.06	4.26	4.02	3.79
N-12	4.45	4.42	4.56	4.47	4.37
N-13	3.76	3.61	3.97	3.74	3.76
Grand Mean, Area N	3.93	3.92	4.14	3.88	3.85
O-1	3.36	3.11	3.91	3.46	2.97
O-2	3.14	2.94	3.42	3.26	2.90
O-3	3.56	3.49	4.03	3.58	3.24
O-4	3.48	3.44	3.91	3.53	3.10
O-5	3.31	3.34	3.75	3.24	3.02
O-6	3.29	3.43	3.81	3.27	2.74
O-7	4.21	4.43	4.19	4.31	3.90
O-8	3.46	3.49	3.90	3.39	3.22
O-9	4.07	4.03	4.48	4.16	3.67
Grand Mean, Area O	3.54	3.52	3.93	3.57	3.19
P-1	3.99	3.86	4.00	4.24	3.73
P-2	3.24	3.29	3.44	3.39	2.83
P-3	3.65	3.54	3.58	3.98	3.31

TABLES OF MEANS OF RESPONSES

Question	Means of Groups				
	All Groups	A Subgroup	B Subgroup	C Subgroup	D Subgroup
P-4	3.13	3.24	2.97	3.53	2.59
P-5	3.51	3.37	3.50	3.75	3.28
P-6	3.62	3.51	3.66	3.81	3.40
Grand Mean, Area P	3.52	3.46	3.52	3.78	3.19
Q-1	4.13	4.31	4.00	4.07	4.14
Q-2	3.55	3.54	3.41	3.70	3.48
Q-3	3.74	3.75	3.55	3.95	3.59
Q-4	3.87	3.74	3.81	3.98	3.85
Q-5	3.59	3.50	3.81	3.52	3.59
Q-6	3.65	3.71	3.75	3.80	3.33
Q-7	3.66	3.77	3.66	3.68	3.55
Q-8	4.07	4.14	4.13	4.16	3.83
Q-9	3.30	3.34	3.41	3.44	3.00
Grand Mean, Area Q	3.72	3.75	3.72	3.81	3.59

In an effort to secure further expressions of opinion and to reflect any areas of research needs that might have been omitted from the survey, all respondents were sent a form, "School Librarianship: A Survey of Areas of Needed Research, Part II," with a covering letter (Appendix B). This form requested the respondents to list their opinions of the major research needs in the field, and was designed to elicit unstructured responses (as opposed to the highly structured design of the survey itself). The physical format of Part II with its requirement of writing an opinion, in addition to the fact that the mailing took place during Christmas vacation and the mid-winter meeting of the American Library Association and that a certain fatigue factor was present, limited the response expected. No follow-up letter was sent.

The response totaled 75 out of 169, or 44.37 per cent. Divided by subgroups, the response was:

RESPONSE TO PART II, BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroup	No. of responses	Per cent
A	15	20
B	16	21.33
C	25	33.33
D	19	25.33
	75	

It should be noted that subgroup C, the state school library supervisors, was larger in Part II than in the original survey. Therefore, the responses in Part II were more representative of the opinions of the state library supervisors than was the case in the original survey.

In Part II the entire group was requested to list areas of needed research in school librarianship. Most respondents commented fairly extensively on school library problems, limiting themselves to from two to five major areas. Others listed briefly many topics, some as many as fifteen to seventeen. The feasibility of research projects or studies on the various problems was rarely considered so that in most cases the respondents appeared to interpret Part II as an opportunity to express their concerns over the major problems or particular local problems in school libraries. For that reason some topics might be included which do not appear to be researchable.

The replies to Part II varied widely, and did not lend themselves to tabulation. Certain problems and trends, however, might be noted and comments concerning them, quoted. In the quotations that follow, the respondents are not identified by name or position, but their inclusion in one of the subgroups is noted: subgroup A, officers and councilors of the American Association of School Librarians; subgroup B, presidents of state school library associations; subgroup C, state school library supervisors; subgroup D, library educators.

The respondents occasionally commented on the "desperate need" for answers to problems. As one (subgroup B) stated, "We are still working on the level of the dark ages." Another respondent (subgroup C) suggested, "Whatever studies are conducted should be freed as much as possible from some of the basic assumptions which the profession has long cherished." Serious questions were raised, some of which dealt with these basic assumptions.

One major recurring topic concerned the education of school library personnel. Over half of the respondents either simply listed this as a problem or included a longer statement about it. Opinions were expressed on the quality of the education of school librarians and on library schools and library school courses. The length of training elicited opinions such as these:

> Is it possible for us to establish a program for preparing school librarians in an undergraduate program? We must keep in mind that the school librarian must have special expertise in library science, audiovisual materials, curriculum at the level he or she is practicing, educational psychology, administration, literature at the level of practice, reading skills, techniques, etc., and teaching processes. We need so many school librarians that it is very unrealistic for them to get an undergraduate degree where they specialize in some area of education and then work toward a master's degree in library science. Is the master's degree in l[ibrary] s[cience] essential for a school building librarian in grades k-6, 7-9, or 10-12, etc.? Is it even practical? Cannot we establish a program for the school librarian to qualify him or her to do the work of a school librarian and do this in the usual four year program for teachers? (Subgroup C)

> I have always felt that a Master's degree in Library Science was never the "first" prime prerequisite of a beginning school librarian. Our schools today train ... teachers in four years, as a rule. It is true that many of these teachers do go on and obtain their Master's degrees. If our institutions of higher learning can turn out specialists ... in four years, why can they not turn out another specialist, the school librarian, in four years? Again, the fifth year degree ill always be greatly encouraged. Returning to the four year preparation of school librarians would undoubtedly help to erase that exceptional shortage in this field. In fact, one of the principal reasons for our shortage of librarians, in all fields, is because of this fifth year requirement. Research, over a period of years, would reveal what many of"our professionals" do not want to admit, or even think about--namely, librarians with four years of college background and training are just as effective and successful as those with a master's degree in the field. (Subgroup A)

Comments on library schools and library school courses also appeared:

> ... it might be very helpful to look into the problem of adequate facilities to train the needed number of librarians. Are our library schools able to accept a sufficient number of students? Are their entrance requirements reasonable? Are the courses offered geared to training school librarians? If not, what changes need to be made so that the school librarian is well trained for the job? (Subgroup C)
>
> Review of the curriculum of library schools to meet the needs of the librarians in the schools, the actual working conditions. (Subgroup B)
>
> Training of persons to become school librarians - this involves a combination of techniques necessary to being a teacher as well as the basic library science courses. The latter should be geared specifically to the school situation. (Subgroup A)
>
> The formal training of school librarians needs thorough study. Much time is spent in such course work as cataloging, etc., which could be better used for training of skills they will need in a school situation. (Subgroup C)
>
> Research should be done concerning the formal non-library training of school librarians. Should emphasis be placed on liberal arts? How much classroom experience should they have before they begin their library training? (Subgroup C)

Education of school librarians - consider the revision of Library School courses to meet the certification requirements for school librarians and the changing needs of the school curriculum. (Subgroup D)

With new stress on concept teaching and inter-disciplinary courses, librarians need to update thinking from the "factual-information, reference book approach." Reference courses might give problems-solving techniques or "case studies" where ref⌊erence⌋ problems are more sophisticated and philosophical. Research might be needed on content and approach of ref⌊erence⌋ courses as compared with actual needs of students and scholars who will be library patrons. (Subgroup D)

Need for more realistic instruction toward practical application, in college Departments of Library Science. (Subgroup D)

What kind of professional training is best for the librarian who will be working in the school library of the future? We need to know more about the kind of training which will best prepare a person to meet the demands of the school library of the future. Does an instructional materials center require a librarian with a different kind of training than that traditionally given in the past? What is the best kind of training for the person who will be working in an instructional materials center and not in a traditional school library? (Subgroup D)

More colleges should offer courses in LIBRARY SCIENCE. (Subgroup B)

Another problem ... is the shortage, so called, of faculty members for Graduate Library Schools. There is actually no shortage whatsoever of skilled, experienced, and well-trained individuals to teach library science subjects. Unfortunately, many of these people lack their "union card," i.e., the Ph.D. or the D.Ed. Studies will reveal that many of our Library School teachers who do have their Doctor's degrees have them in such fields as History, English, Foreign Languages, etc., in everything but Library Science. Because they do have a Doctor's degree they automatically are a specialist in any field they choose to follow. (Of course, they have "at least" a Master's degree in Library Science). A Doctor's degree is ... ⌊not⌋ a necessary requirement for a Graduate Library School teacher ... . (Subgroup A)

> There has been a de-emphasis on the specialty of school librarianship in library schools across the nation and the effect is being felt in education to the detriment of millions of children. (Subgroup C)
>
> Development of courses for school librarians: 1. Advanced book courses, 2. advanced a[udio]-v[isual] courses. (Subgroup D)
>
> Orientation of a school librarian's professional training toward service in a school. (Subgroup C)
>
> The education of school librarians. Is a teaching credential really necessary? What makes the efficient, capable, and imaginative school librarian? (Subgroup D)
>
> One area that concerns me is the screening of people coming into the library schools. The image of the librarian is a very important factor. Should we not be very careful of those individuals who have not been contented in a first choice of professional work? (Subgroup D)

Some library leaders stated their opinions on an extended program of education:

> What about educating and training school librarians for various facets of the program? (i.e. supervision, instructional media, work with teachers and administrators). (Subgroup C)
>
> Education of school librarians for (1) elementary, j[unior] h[igh] s[chool], h[igh] s[chool], supervisory levels, (2) professional and non-professional levels, (3) student guidance and team teaching situations. (Subgroup D)
>
> Training of school librarians for new programs. (Subgroup D)
>
> Competencies essential [, determined] in job analysis of school librarians. Education for these competencies - both general and library education. (Subgroup A)
>
> Educational preparation of school librarians. Educational preparation of school library supervisors. (Subgroup A)
>
> Continuing education of school librarians. (Subgroup C and D)
>
> Research on ways and means for up-dating attitudes of practicing school librarians seems of greatest importance to me now. There are so few NDEA Institutes and this type of re-education will no longer be available after this summer. (Subgroup B)

Some respondents observed the varying needs of the partially-trained librarian and the non-professional:

> Untrained teacher personnel who are given the responsibility of school libraries need help. Would it be possible for colleges to offer more extension work in library skills at selected points so that the teacher-librarian could drive fifty miles or less to take courses. (Subgroup C)

> Personnel attempting to administer library programs, particularly in elementary schools, are not library-trained, yet are called "librarians." Implication: Stronger certification standards need to be adopted and "enforced." Research: Method of achieving stronger standards for certification and "enforcement" of same. (Subgroup C)

> The place of the library technician or library aide in the school library program. Should there be library aides as there are teacher aides? What should these people do? How should they be chosen and prepared for their duties? (Subgroup A)

Another major topic noted by many respondents was the shortage of school librarians and the need for increased effort in recruitment. Approximately one-fifth listed or commented on this topic:

> Better ways of recruiting better librarians. (Subgroup B)

> Study recruitment methods and effectiveness. (Subgroup C)

> Best methods of recruitment. That is, what types have yielded best results in the past? (Subgroup C)

> What can be done to increase interest in librarianship so that more help can be had? Right now, our concern is qualified librarians who will alleviate some areas in desperate need of librarians. ... . Personally I can't see where this lends itself too easily to research except that it might bring out reasons why so few are going into the field ... . (Subgroup B)

> Perhaps recruitment is the major problem in our state. Even when we recruit possible candidates, very few of the colleges within our state offer courses. Because tuition is much more reasonable in our state schools than if students go out of state, many will go into other fields. Is this true of other states? If so, could this be one of the reasons for the scarcity of librarians? I personally feel that school librarians ... are stymied in their efforts to bring about better working conditions until more qualified librarians can be found. (Subgroup B)

> When we determine how best to prepare school librarians, then we must undertake new and imaginative approaches to recruitment. Once the personnel problem is on its way to solution, then we will have the people to solve the myriad of other concerns facing school librarianship. (Subgroup C)

> Because of Federal funds plus other trends which are producing a rise in interest concerning school library development, the need for additional librarians is bound to produce a problem. Consequently, I feel that emphasis should be placed on recruitment. Probably recruitment should receive the highest priority when considering areas of school librarianship in which to conduct research. (Subgroup C)

Another facet of the field that the school library leaders wanted research in was that dealing with some basic assumptions of school librarianship. Here the leaders wanted research into the aims, objectives, and effectiveness of the library in the school:

> Can we document the assertion that a good centralized library (instructional materials center) not only promotes more effective teaching - and learning - but also is the economical way to acquire and administer instructional materials (Subgroup C)

> The number one problem is the establishment of a clear definition of the precise role of the school library in contemporary education. This would require a detailed study of the relationship of the library to the total educational complex. Directly related to this would be an assessment of the role of the school librarian with regard to the educational objectives of the school. (Subgroup C)

> At a time when so much attention has suddenly been focused upon the school library it is not enough to assume that a school library is ipso facto a good thing simply because it exists and receives some measure of use. If Title II did nothing else, it did reveal the fantastic discrepancy which exists among all those facilities which have been called "school libraries". Is a bookcase in a principal's office or a mediocre classroom collection actually better than no library at all in terms of really effective service to students? (Subgroup C)

> The school library and the curriculum. We need to know more about how the school library can be used to implement the school curriculum, how the librarian can be used in helping to develop the curriculum, what is the prpoer role of the library in relation to the curriculum, etc. (Subgroup D)
>
> The school library and the educational and technological revolution. For the past five years there has been a kind of educational revolution under way, with new concepts, changing ideas, new methods, etc. .... . We need to know more about what the school library can do to assist in this revolution. What is the library's role in team teaching; what new demands have the educational revolution made on the school library? We know quite a bit from experience, empirically, but we need to know more, and what we know should have a sounder scientific basis. The same applies to the school library and the technological revolution. How can the school library best take advantage of the new machines which have become available? How will this technological revolution shape the future of the school library? (Subgroup D)

Questions on the effectiveness of school libraries or instructional materials center were also included here:

> Effective school library programs. How can effectiveness be measured. In what areas are we succeeding? In what areas are we failing? What are the contributing factors to our failure? (Subgroup A)
>
> Contributions of the school library to the teaching and learning processes. (Subgroup A, Subgroup C, Subgroup C)
>
> A definition of what a reasonably good library or materials center should encompass. The personnel needed to effectively operate the materials center. (Subgroup C)
>
> Evaluation of school libraries which would include such items as resources, programs, services, effectiveness in the school program, etc. (Subgroup D)
>
> What actual contribution does the school librarian make to the gross learning which takes place in the school? What part of the actual teaching does the librarian do? What part of it should the librarian do? How can we justify? The teaching and learning of concern here is that in the total curriculum and not just in library science for students and teachers or in utilization of media of learning or instruction. The implication here is that if the answers are not significantly positive then we might possibly have technicians fo the technical work and leave the teaching to the teachers. .... . A second implication

> here is that if we cannot find significantly positive answers to such questions, probably we cannot justify our suggestions of a librarian in each school. The library, yes -- But possibly not the professional librarian. (Subgroup C)
>
> The effectiveness of the school library as an instructional materials center in today's changing education. (Subgroup B)
>
> Measuring implementation of the I[nstructional] M[aterials] C[enter] Concept. (Accommodation of the cross media approach in school libraries.) Subgroup C
>
> Instructional Materials Center concept. We need all types of research studies to help us implement this concept on a state-wide basis - especially its effect on the total instructional program, the effect budget-wise in use of funds in this concept as related to those of other organizational patterns. (Subgroup C)
>
> Research into the cost, procedures, and techniques of ... the development of instructional materials centers. (Subgroup C)
>
> A study of the use of a variety of media in school libraries and the effect on learning of the I[nstructional] M[aterials] C[enter] approach. (Subgroup C)

The influence of school library programs on students was also noted in the general topic of school library effectiveness:

> The effectiveness of school library services related to the academic and personal development of pupils. (Subgroup D)
>
> More research should be done with the benefits the children derive from a well-rounded library program with the materials center concept. If possible, groups with this type of library program contrasted with control groups who have classroom collections or other library services. (Subgroup B)
>
> The effect of the school library upon student academic success. (Subgroup C)
>
> Effectiveness of school library service. We need to know more about how the school library can more effectively serve students... . That is, what are the most effective things the school library can do to help students, if the library is an instructional materials center, if it has study carrels and listening stations, if there is non-scheduled use of the library, etc.? (Subgroup D)

> Is it true, as school librarians believe, that having convenient access to really good school library materials and services makes an appreciable difference in students' level of performance in their curricular activities. (Subgroup C)
>
> Attempt to get concrete proof that a student who knows materials and libraries will succeed better in college and in business. (Subgroup D)

In addition to the education and recruitment of school librarians and to questions on the effectiveness of school libraries, the respondents commented on teachers' and administrators' use, educational preparation, and attitudes toward school libraries. Reactions on school administrators were:

> Greater recognition of duties and needs of librarians, on the part of school administrators, including need for adequate staff and clerical help. (Subgroup D)
>
> Getting cooperation from the administration on library matters. (Subgroup B)
>
> School administrative awareness of values of the library, and of professionally trained librarians. The concept of subject specialists (non-library-trained) to man the satellite libraries needs further refinement and orientation towards library principles. There is a possibility of the librarian becoming the hand-maiden of the subject specialists (See Lloyd Trump's version of I⸤ nstructional, M⸤aterials, C⸤enters,). (Subgroup C)
>
> Need for better understanding of and stronger leadership from school superintendents. (Subgroup A)
>
> Attitudes of top administrators toward school librarianship and reasons for these attitudes. (Subgroup A)
>
> Attitude and cooperation of school administrator toward the library. (Subgroup B)
>
> Working with administrators in promotion of school library services. (This is to include ways of informing the administrators of the advantages of the materials center idea and working through him to draw all the teachers into greater participation.) I feel strongly about this. Many of our administrators grew up in schools where there was

no centralized library. They need to be sold on the idea of the benefits to the students from the materials center as we know it today. (Subgroup B)

The need to communicate to teachers and administrators the value of library service. The field of education needs understanding of the potential value of good library service. (Subgroup A)

Inclusion of "purposes and use of school libraries" in curriculum of institutions training administrators and teachers. (Subgroup D)

Educating, through institutes and workshops, school administrators, the school boards, the teachers, and other interested persons, the exact demands placed upon a school librarian, so that the school library is not considered a "frill" to education but is the "core" of all education. This involves the need for allocating adequate budgets, adequate space and equipment, adequate help, and the policy prerogative of a school librarian. (Subgroup A)

Comments related to teachers included:

Teacher involvement in the uses of library resources. (Subgroup A)

A course in the fundamentals of LIBRARY SCIENCE and the operating of a school library should be required of ALL future teachers. (Very few teachers know how to use a library effectively) (Subgroup B)

Correlation of work of school librarians with that of classroom teachers - especially, training of classroom teachers to take advantage of library resources. Research might cover the adequacy of training being received by teachers within basic education and professional training. (Subgroup D)

Relationship of the school library and librarian to teachers and to new methods of teaching, such as team teaching, independent study emphasis, educational television. (Subgroup A)

Use of the library by all departments. Relationship of the library and audio-visual. Recognition by faculty of the library as a teaching instrument. (Subgroup D)

Teachers who are "non-library" users. (Subgroup D)

Teacher use of school libraries.(Subgroup B)

Teacher participation in library activities.(Subgroup B)

Encouraging teachers to use the library. (Subgroup B)

Teacher-librarian relations, i. e., involving the teacher in the further use of the library for her students' needs. (Subgroup C)

Some research should be done to document the fact that the majority of teachers do not know how to use instructional materials. This could be then be used to help persuade teacher training institutions of the need to include this kind of information in the pre-service courses for teachers. (Subgroup C)

Another area in which the respondents indicated a need for research was that of centralized cataloging, processing, and handling of library materials:

Survey of centralized processing in school systems. (Both a survey and a study of effective programs).(Subgroup C)

Research on centralized processing of books and non-print materials, i.e., methods, costs, etc. (Subgroup A)

Centralized services at local, county, state, or regional levels. (Subgroup C)

Local vs. centralized and/or commercial processing - - advantages, disadvantage in terms of labor and finance involved and with consideration of many collections handled by persons with minimal training. (Subgroup C)

Central cataloging of books, audio-visual materials, and other related non-book materials in the school library. However, adequate help, space, and budget is needed to achieve this goal. (Subgroup A)

Some facts and figures (good ones) to show values of centralized processing ... versus use of commercial processing. (Subgroup D)

Cost studies of centralized technical services including ordering, cataloging and processing - District plans and commercial firms. (Subgroup D)

I think one of the most important areas ... is the one of centralization of school library program. In our own system we have a crying need for such a system. Centralizing purchasing, SELECTION, and processing of books and other instructional materials for a system with several schools. Not only the incredible waste of time and money but the sad need of trained personnel to work together on this. (Subgroup B)

A further aspect of the field which was observed as needing research was that of the selection and handling of books and non-print materials. These observations are quoted below, and are generally organized as statements on books, paperbacks, and non-print materials.

> Book selection: upgrading of sources from which books and materials are selected. Present resources librarians are requested to use fail to meet curriculum needs. (Subgroup B)
>
> All problems in connection with selection of materials. With additional funds available in so many schools and with expansion of materials to include all types and forms, wise selection and the building of sound collections seems to me to be of first priority. (Subgroup A)
>
> Guidelines for the evaluation of materials - more than philosophical selection principles. (Subgroup C)
>
> A study of the methods used for the selection of materials and of the tools that are used (their strengths and weaknesses).(Subgroup C)
>
> Something needs to be done on the book selection process: what are bases for selection, is it a local matter, prevalence of state recommended lists, etc. (Subgroup C)
>
> Pressures on the state to provide each school with professional assistance in view of the fact we are receiving materials under Title II. Who is qualified to get these books into the right place for our students. (Subgroup D)
>
> Paperbacks - - their value for school libraries; recommendations for cataloging, processing, shelving, and circulating. What about placing quantities in classrooms? Would this affect adversely or in a positive fashion school library service? (Subgroup C)
>
> Selection and use of non-book materials. (Subgroup D)
>
> Developing techniques for housing and administering the new materials. (Subgroup D)
>
> Research into the area of evaluating media for Audio-Visual materials and nonfiction books concerning their availability, creditability, and their standards. (Subgroup C)

> A basic list of A[udio] V[isual] materials (such as films, filmstrips, records, tapes, slides, picture sets, transparencies), suitable for curriculum development in grades K to 6. This could be a joint project ... . It could include information on criteria for selection, processing services and reputable distributers of these materials in regions ... . (Subgroup A)

> We need evaluative criteria or standards for purchasing non-book materials for the new I[nstructional] M[aterials] C[enters] ... . (Subgroup B)

The topics, school librarians' education and recruitment, the effectiveness of school libraries, teachers/administrators and the library, centralized processing, and the handling and selection of print and non-print materials, were the major areas mentioned by the respondents. There were other areas which were of interest, which were not as prominently commented upon, but which idicated research or information needs. Some of these were: supervision; demonstration libraries; state school library agencies; regional centers or depositories; cataloging; use of libraries for non-library activities; media for reviewing materials; library instruction; librarian's workload and professional and non-professional tasks; federal aid to libraries and librarians; cooperation with other libraries; developmental values in children's books; image and personality of the librarian; student assistants in the library; non-professional assistants; certification requirements; inter-library loans; guidance in the library; public relations within and outside the school; the librarian and curriculum development; libraries within small schools; scheduling of classes in the the library; organizational patterns of school libraries; job analyses; school library practices in technical services;

standards for school libraries; school libraries and the reading program; independent resource centers; cost studies; intermediate level collections; school library positions as compared with other libraries' positions; automation; tools for evaluating school libraries; articulation of student library education; and extended school library service. In some cases only one respondent stated that research was needed in the area, but in other cases three to four mentioned the topic. Some of the comments on these subjects are noted below. Federal aid to libraries and librarians was directly mentioned several times, and was indirectly noted as parts of other statements.

> The realistic effect of federal funds. How have these monies been used? What was the starting point? What has realistically been accomplished? (Subgroup D)
>
> Effectiveness of N(ational), D(efense), E(ducation), A(ct), Institutes for school librarianship, programs under the Higher Education Act for school libraries, etc. (Subgroup C)
>
> A more systematic way of handling Title II funds on the national and state levels. (Funds are not made available to the state until the school year is almost half over) Guide lines are changed. (Subgroup B)

Problems dealing with supervision and supervisory personnel were also noticed.

> Various organizational patterns of service for District Library Supervisors and the effectiveness of each. (Subgroup C)
>
> The role of the school library supervisor. Place in the school district's organization; authority, etc. (Subgroup D)
>
> How effectual and necessary is a state director of school libraries? Is this a person all state educational agencies should have? In what capacities can he best serve? (Subgroup B)

> For library supervisors, new curricula needed - should include work in personnel supervision, school administration, and finance. Research needed comparing the allowable electives, and needs as seen by present library supervisors, and their administrators. (Subgroup D)

The librarian's workload and the professional and non-professional tasks assigned to and accomplished by him was an area of concern, as was the related subject of non-professional assistants.

> Workload of professional librarians - Report on actual costs of professional librarians' performing mechanical routines. (Subgroup C)
>
> Rights of a school librarian to compensate for time involved; ie, differential on pay scale; opportunity to attend departmental meetings in the school and to contribute the library's share; encouragement to attend professional meetings ... . (Subgroup A)
>
> Comparison of time spent by professional librarians in professional, educational and curriculum-type duties compared to clerical work such as typing, filing, cataloging etc. (Subgroup C)
>
> Job analysis and job descriptions for professional staff. (Subgroup D)
>
> School librarians are often given additional assignments instead of library work. e.g. Home room, classes, study hall. (Subgroup B)
>
> Lack of adult clerical and technical assistants hired locally to free librarians from clerical tasks so they can develop sound programs and increase library services. Implication: Increased budgets for over-all library programs are necessary to provide this assistance. Research: Budget needs to support additional needed personnel. (Subgroup C)
>
> Provision for clerical help (so that a librarian can be a librarian!). (Subgroup B)
>
> Clerical tasks essential in school library service. (Subgroup A)

Some persons replied by suggesting the establishment of regional centers, demonstration centers, or depositories to serve school libraries and librarians.

> Possibilities in establishing regional centers for evaluation of school library materials. (Subgroup D)
>
> The Knapp School Projects have proven what can be done with money and dedicated librarians but there aren't enough of them and too few administrators have visited them. Could ways of establishing demonstration school libraries in each state probably through the state education agencies be studied with guidelines for same? (Subgroup B)
>
> The establishment of regional depositories of original publications, such as individual school library procedures manuals -- curriculum units, including lists of instructional materials used for areas covered in certain grades -- games, homemade or commercially produced, used for library instruction in elementary schools. Original copies could be ... reproduced on request at nominal cost. (Subgroup A)
>
> Materials selection becoming increasingly difficult with so many different media being included in library collections. Implication: Need to develop many more materials selection and processing centers with librarians having released time to attend regularly scheduled meetings at such centers. Research: Cost of establishing such centers; number of libraries needed to participate in these centers for them to be economically feasible. (Subgroup C)

The problems of public library and school library cooperation were also raised.

> Cooperation among types of libraries in servicing children, young people, and adults. (Potential, possible limitations, guidelines). (Subgroup D)
>
> Combination School-Public libraries - how the various patron needs are met or neglected - effect on instructional program - why they are not very successful. (Subgroup C)
>
> Research to develop better lines of communication among the school librarian, the school's faculty, and the public library in the community. (Subgroup A)

Research needs in library science instruction for pupils and in flexible scheduling were observed.

> Continuity of student library education from elementary level through high school - a well-developed co-ordination under a qualified director of school libraries. (Subgroup A)
>
> A study of the teaching of library skills, its effectiveness and methods. (Subgroup C)
>
> What types of library instruction result in better learning? (Subgroup C)
>
> Number of High Schools giving LIBRARY SCIENCE for credit? ... . This provides the students with an opportunity to learn and serve. Many enter library work after graduating. ... . Some have continued their education for LIBRARIANSHIP. ... . We prepare students for many jobs in high school, so why not more emphasis on the library field. (Subgroup B)
>
> Flexible versus Scheduled Library Periods (elementary level). (Subgroup C)
>
> At the elementary level, attention given to out-moded "scheduled class" set-up versus freed use of the library as a mateials center. (Subgroup D)

Representative opinions on research needs on a variety of topics are quoted below. In most cases only one and in a very few cases two or three respondents indicated a need in the area.

> Automation -- What electronic machinery and automated equipment is recommended for library routines and instruction? (Subgroup C)
>
> Intermediate level collections to serve several small school districts - various possibilities - how much, what kind of materials - how financed - how services are provided, etc. (Subgroup C)
>
> An updated study similar to Dr. Alice B. McGuire's study at the University of Chicago on developmental values in children's books. (Subgroup C)
>
> An updated study of state school library and instructional materials services. (Subgroup C)

More needs to be done in how to best publicize the activities of the library. This is to include more at the grass roots level. I believe that one of the short comings of libraries and librarians today is that they are so busy with the many tasks that they do not realize the value of publicity. It is through this publicity that perhaps we can do much good for the profession and for the persons being served. (Subgroup B)

The total reading program which would include cooperation with faculty, administrators, book selection, public library cooperation. (Subgroup D)

Effectiveness of book selection committee. (Subgroup C)

Study of states' standards and enforcement of standards. (Subgroup C)

New trends in library administration should be applied to the small school unit, attempting to answer such questions as: (a) computer programming applied to school library needs (Many school systems are now adding such equipment - how can library system within the school use it), (b) volume-of-work studies on the point at which it is profitable to add expensive equipment for processing, circulation, repair and/or rebinding ..., (c) cooperative systems for book selection, cataloging and/or processing. (Subgroup D)

Extended hours of library service - status quo and best ways of doing. (Subgroup D)

Cost studies of library service. (Subgroup D)

Inter-library loans between or among high schools. (Subgroup B)

Guidance opportunities in the library. (Subgroup B)

Practices in organizing and administering primary, middle school and high school libraries. Problems and patterns of organizing and administering separate and combined libraries and audiovisual centers. Comparison of the availability of materials, services, costs and personnel in central school libraries and independent resource centers. (Subgroup C)

A study of the use of student library assistants, educational value of such programs, aims of programs, problems and effects of programs on students participating in them. (Subgroup C)

Practices and problems in the use of traveling school librarians. (Subgroup C)

The personality and "image" of the school librarian. (Subgroup B)

The role of the school librarian in curriculum development. Realistically. (Subgroup D)

Relationship of the school librarian with the school guidance department. (Subgroup B)

Research is needed covering areas of school library practices - their value (or lack of it) - I refer to such items as fines, accession records, etc. Do these really have a function in a school library? (Subgroup C)

Certification. What are the library- audio, visual, functions and how should certification be divided? What should be the regulations for part-time teaching librarians in rural areas? (Subgroup C)

Effective organizational patterns for maximum use of materials.(Subgroup C)

Use of Library of Congress class numbers in secondary school libraries. (Subgroup C)

To What degree should technical and other procedures in school libraries agree with those in neighboring public and university libraries? (Subgroup C)

Professional collections -- Location; size; how serviced. (Subgroup C)

The need for trained librarians who are knowledgeable in the field of human relations and who will place people above techniques. (Subgroup A)

The greatest need is research into areas which will focus the attention of administrators, teachers, and government officials on the contribution which the school library can make to the instructional program, especially, the need for trained personnel and the organization of school libraries with adequate personnel so that they can render the highest service. Most school librarians are not trainedin library schools today to be able to administer or organize a materials center. Nor are educators educated to realize the contribution the library can make or what their role is, what their responsibilities are in a library centered school. (Subgroup D)

Thus, Part II has revealed that the major concerns of school library leaders, as represented by the respondents, was in the education of school librarians and in recruitment. School librarians' education was listed by over half of all the leaders in all the subgroups. It was interesting that subgroup D, the library educators, was disquieted by this topic and suggested research. Subgroup C, the state library supervisors, also evinced interest in the proper education of librarians and non-professional personnel. Attention was directed to the training of school librarians in instructional materials and in the management of materials centers. Continuing education, especially in workshops and institutes, was stressed. Despite the interest shown by subgroup D in school librarians' education, only one respondent stated that advanced degree work was desirable.

Reflecting the shortage of school librarians, some twenty per cent of the respondents, especially subgroup C, expressed the responsibility of the profession to attract and retain competent school librarians. Although the library leaders communicated their doubts over whether or not the topic, i.e. recruitment, could be researched, a fairly large number listed it anyway, many stating in effect that the multiple problems of school libraries could not be solved until the scarcity of professional librarians was alleviated. A substantial number also indicated that perhaps professional librarians were assigned or did too many non-library or non-professional tasks, thus contributing to the waste of professional time and to the shortage of librarians.

In addition to the two major areas, the respondents were also interested in other research topics. In general, the following topics represented the expressed opinions and concerns of approximately ten to fifteen per cent of the respondents: (1) the effectiveness of the school library; (2) relationships between school librarians and administrators and teachers; (3) centralized processing; and (4) the selection of book and non-book materials. Questions arose on proving the value of the centralized school library, its contributions to the school program, and its effectiveness as related to student academic achievement and personal development. Subgroup C, the state school library supervisors, was particularly interested in establishing the values of the instructional materials center approach. Probes were suggested into the attitudes of school administrators and teachers toward the educational contributions of the school library and toward the school librarian as a specialist. Some respondents expressed the belief that these attitudes, a lack of cooperation with the school librarian, were reflective of the professional preparation of teachers and administrators and asked for a study of library instruction and orientation in teacher-training institutions. The questions of attitude and cooperation were not generally those of subgroup D, the library educators.

The interest in centralized processing was principally evidenced in questions on the feasibility and costs of setting up and maintaining such centers. Needs in the field of selection were varied. The continuing problems of the selection of books, their relation to curricular and extra-curricular requirements, and the quality of reviewing periodicals were listed. Also, the library leaders were concerned with the selection of non-print materials, and particularly with reliable reviewing media for them. Some respondents noted that the problems on selection have been compounded by the pressures of the availability of funds under the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Diverse other needs were also included by individual library leaders.

In general, it should be noted that the persons responding to Part II were mainly concerned with questions about the philosophy of the school library program, increasing library service through better prepared and additional personnel, through bigger and more carefully selected collections, and through more effort to improve instruction by cooperation and understanding with the faculty and administration of the schools. There were two fields in which greater interest might have been expected because of the emphasis on them in the past five years. These two areas, standards for school library programs and federal aid to education and libraries, were mentioned only occasionally. Almost completely lacking was any indication of interest in personal student reading guidance, relationships with students as individuals, and interdependence and affiliation with other libraries and librarians.

Accomplished research was located through a search of the literature. Various indexes and bibliographies were used: BIBLIOGRAPHIC INDEX; EDUCATION INDEX; LIBRARY SCIENCE ABSTRACTS; LIBRARY SCIENCE DISSERTATIONS; LIBRARY LITERATURE; DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS; LIBRARY RESEARCH IN PROGRESS; "Graduate Theses Accepted by Library Schools" in LIBRARY QUARTERLY; and "Current Research" in SCHOOL LIBRARIES. Other bibliographies were also checked. When available, all studies were read and annotated, or noted. Master's theses are lightly represented here, as they were difficult to obtain and generally dealt with reviews and syntheses of existing studies or various problems which were strictly local in nature.

No attempt was made to include purely descriptive commentaries on an individual's or an individual library's particular investigation of local situations in school librarianship, unless in the judgment of the investigator they appeared to have a more universal appeal and use. Thus, statistical studies, case studies, historical reviews, masters' theses, doctoral dissertations and similar research are included here when they were available.

The various studies were then categorized into the areas of research needs, with the same organization and headings as were used in the basic questionnaire, and comments and descriptions of the studies were written. Full bibliographic citations were omitted from the text as being too cumbersome, but studies cited may be identified by referring to the bibliography.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

This section deals not only with the library's contribution to the teaching-learning process, but also with the general effectiveness of the library and with the library as a materials center. Also included are historical studies and examinations of school library laws. Some status studies are placed here and some are included later according to the subject or major emphasis.

History

Histories of school libraries, such as the Cole article[1.] (1959), traced generally school library development. Vought (1923) described the evolution of school libraries, basing much of her article on New York's history. Mary Hall's history (1915) concentrated on the high school, while Whitenack's (1956) was concerned with elementary schools. Aldrich (1959) reviewed the history of school libraries in Ohio, emphasizing the legislative history. Aldrich's study contained interesting descriptions of the struggles of the school district libraries and conclusions on the activities of the state department of education. Concerning state standards, Aldrich stated, "There is no exact set of standards desirable for all school libraries in Ohio... . Constructive standards should be sufficiently flexible to accomodate local needs and desires."

In an attempt to examine the development of the school library as a materials center, Hartz and Samuelson (1965) reviewed the library standards of the American Association of School Librarians and the literature of education and librarianship, and stated,

---

[1.] Consult bibliography for complete citations.

"It is generally conceded that by 1940 ..." the library became the "... center of all school activities." Although the early Certain standards contained recommendations on the then existing audio-visual materials, "... it is not until the 1950 edition [of the EVALUATIVE CRITERIA] that the library is designated as a resource center of instructional materials," according to Hartz and Samuelson.

Frances Henne (1955) commented on the trends in school libraries for twenty-five years, identifying these trends as "... expansion of library facilities, reiteration of objectives and goals, and extension of library services." Henne described public library service to children and the elementary school library movement, stating, "Of the developments during the past twenty-five years, one seems to stand out above all others - the effort to make good library service easily accessible to children." In her discussion, "Toward Excellence in School-Library Programs," Henne (1960) identified influential socio-educational forces in school library development: (1) improvement of schools, higher standards and enriched curricula; (2) imaginative teaching; (3) increased numbers of students; (4) expansion and changes in knowledge; (5) "... the ability to use a library and its resources is one of the major rudiments of education... . The critical analysis and evaluation of materials and judgment and reflection regarding the use of their contents form part of the educational process... ." Henne further noted factors which have retarded development: anti-intellectualism; adult dependence on mass media; adult unfamiliarity with school libraries; lack of leadership and money; and the time lag between the acceptance of an educational idea and its adoption for use. On this latter point Henne observed, in a footnote:

> The fifty years that is frequently given as an extreme time span between the introduction and acceptance of an idea has now lapsed for school libraries. School libraries have been described as being in a pioneer stage for so many years that surely theirs is one of the longest pioneer periods in history, and this writer, for one, is weary of wearing a coonskin cap. It should be stressed that the lag for school libraries is not one between quality and the stage just beneath quality; it is all too frequently the lag between quality and nothing or between quality and what is poor or downright bad.

Spears (1948) described, in parallel columns, "yesterday's library, today's library, and tomorrow's library," demonstrating the changing concepts of the library's contribution, and supporting his view of the library as the co-ordinating curriculum agency.

General Aims and Objectives

The library's contribution to the education of the student might be indicated in several studies. Hastings and Tanner's study (1963) was designed to discover "... whether improved English language skills could be developed at the tenth-grade level through systematic library experiences in place of the traditional emphasis on formal English grammar." Four matched groups of students, two experimental and two control, were pretested, with no significant differences among the groups found. The experimental groups worked systematically in the library; the control groups did not. Posttests revealed that one experimental group, which had no formal teaching of grammar except where "... particular problems arose within a functional context ... tended to surpass all other classes at statistically significant levels in tests involving grammar and spelling skills." The authors then concluded, "... it is indeed worthwhile for the English teacher to provide systematic experiences in library reference work throughout the course of instruction."

Another study by Barrilleaux (1963) in science education attempted to determine "... the effects of using multiple library sources as compared to the use of an issued textbook in eighth grade science." One section of students was given a textbook and invited to use other materials; the other used multiple library materials, but no textbook. The investigator judged that "There appears to be a tendency for eighth grade students using library references to be, on the average, superior to... students with textbooks - in gains of science understandings and reading ability in science" and"... to show greater growth in critical thinking ability... ." The differences between the groups in factual informal was not significant.

School library activities and the effects on pupils were portrayed in the Day and Jones report of the 1961 Southern States Work Conference. Trinkler's compilation (1962) also provides various descriptions of library programs. R.M. Jones (1953), in her research of the school library's contribution to the objectives of elementary education through the selection and use of books, concluded that the library "... can aid materially in the accomplishment of the objectives..." by knowing the aims and methods of elementary education, cooperation with the faculty, knowledge of children, publicizing and evaluating library activities, and by encouraging student participation in selection and increased competencies for book selectors.

An interesting, but descriptive, commentary on library centralization was that of the Kankakee, Illinois, schools (1965) where classroom collections were prevalent. In maintaining classroom collections, one principal observed, "First, we feel that it's easier to check books out of each room and second, a central library ties up a room and a teacher which could be used for general instruction. But if we could profit by having a central library we would investigate it more thoroughly."

One of the most informative studies on libraries in schools was the Gaver research (1960) on the effectiveness of centralized library service in elementary schools. Designed "... to determine whether objective evidence could be secured to justify the establishment of elementary-school libraries...," the stated purposes were:

> (1) to develop instruments which will evaluate the program of library services available in elementary schools in terms of (a) the provision of library-related materials, (b) the accessibility of resources and services, (c) the extent of library-related activities, (d) the degree of pupil mastery of library skills, and (e) the amount and kind of reading done by children; and (2) to study the scores and ratings obtained on these instruments in terms of (a) their relationship to measures of educational achievement and community position and (b) their ability to differentiate between schools having varying degrees of library provisions.

Six elementary schools, divided into three categories of two each (Category I, classroom collections only; Category II, central collections but no librarian; Category III, central libraries with a librarian), were selected on the basis of grade distribution, availability of past scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, and the representation in Category I, II, or III. The population studied included the faculties and the sixth grade students in the schools. Some of the variables studied and correlated were educational achievement, socio-economic status, collections, accessibility, library activities, student library skills, and student reading. Gaver found that the measures used "... clearly differentiated in favor of the school-library category [III],..." in collections, accessibility, activities, and library skills. "The measure of the amount and quality of reading provided substantial differentiation in favor of the library category on the basis of the amount of reading. On the basis of the quality of reading, there was differentiation in favor of the school library ... ." Higher student educational gain was found in the school-library category. No relationship was found between family socio-economic level and the provision of a school library. The investigator concluded, recognizing the limitations of the study (a major one being the small sample), that "... definite advantages accrue in the school that has a school library manned by a professional library staff." Replication of the study was planned, but not funded.

A reading consultant in one of the Knapp Project schools, Adams (1965) reported her observations on the changes in the role of the elementary school library and on the effects of library service on pupil reading.

A major study by Lowrie (1961) reported on elementary school libraries. After consulting administrators, teachers, and librarians in forty-eight schools in ten systems in eight states, Lowrie found general acceptance of the philosophy and services of the school library, noted experiences in curriculum enrichment, commented on reading guidance, and observed the need for understanding of the contributions to the school and the potentialities of the elementary school library.

Willson (1965) evaluated the effectiveness of centralized elementary school libraries by examining the differences among sixth grade pupils in six schools having centralized libraries and six matched schools without centralized libraries. Pupil outcomes and related factors were tested by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, California Test of Mental Maturity, and Gaver's Accessibility of Learning Materials Rating Scores, Library Activities Checklist, and the Library Skills Test (modified). Willson found measurable differences in reading ability, achievement test scores, research skills, and general educational gain between students in schools with centralized libraries and students in schools without centralized libraries. She also found a measurable effect on learning due, in part, to the activities of the library.

Gaver's reviews (1963 and 1965) of the applicants for the Encyclopedia Britannica awards pointed out the factors important in the development of elementary school libraries. Among these were long-range improvement plans, leadership by state and local supervisors, financial support, interest on the part of citizens and administrators' support.

Paralleling, in some respects, the Gaver work on elementary school libraries, Sullivan (1966) examined the Knapp School Library Project as it concerned secondary school libraries. In her "Knapp School Library Project," Sullivan reported on the evaluation policies used to select the schools. Among the factors evaluated were: geographic distribution (with the Midwest furnishing most applicants); varied student enrollment; book collections; curriculat changes; procedures, resources, and policies for material selection ("... few can point toward an established, adopted policy for the selection of materials"); audio-visual materials; extended hours of service; physical facilities; staffing; and school library programs. Sullivan followed this report with an analysis of the "Knapp High Schools and the ALA Standards" (1966). Here facilities, staff, and collections of the three Knapp Project high schools were compaed with the 1960 STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS.

Instructional Materials Centers

The concept of the school library as an instructional materials center has received some attention.

Hall (1963) in his dissertation on the organization of instructional materials centers found not only a variety in the concept of the instructional materials center, but also that " the concept of integrating the library with audio-visual communication services... has been realized only to a limited degree in actual practice."

Sattley (1956) and others have voiced some objections to the instructional materials centers and to the practicality of their being implemented, pointing out the scarcity of librarians, the workload that precludes the additional burden of audio-visual materials, and the shift in service emphasis from the student to the teacher. In "The School Library as a Materials Center" (1963), edited by Mahar, the principal focus was on the educational preparation of librarians administering such centers. In this, contrary to the findings of Hall, Lohrer stated, "With very few exceptions, the instructional materials center concept of the school library has been accepted and is being implemented ... ." Lohrer further commented that successful programs were generally administered and used by librarians and teachers knowledgeable in library and audio-visual methods and principally interested in providing for the needs of students. Lohrer further described her study (1963), the purpose of which was to discover the extent to which the traditional school library had expanded to act as an instructional materials center, and what such expansion implied for the education of school librarians.

School libraries in thirty-two states were visited, and a checklist was designed to give information on staff, resources, organization, equipment and facilities, and budget. Visits to accredited library schools and analyses of over three hundred catalogs of colleges having library science and/or audio-visual courses were accomplished. Although the effective implementation of the concept of instructional materials centers appeared scattered throughout the country, Lohrer found that excellent elementary and junior high school centers might generally be identified as being in the southern and western states, that some of the Illinois and other midwestern states had excellent individual centers, that states lacking state supervisors or having large areas and scattered populations tended to lag behind others, and that large city systems appeared to be more traditional in approach. Lohrer commented, "With the exception of Florida, no state stands out as having a fully developed program of school libraries which accepts the philosophy of the national 'Standards for School Library Programs'."

An interesting survey to determine the status and relationships of school library and audio-visual services in the state of Washington was that reported by Ahlers (1964). The survey used two questionnaires, one for individual building programs and one for district programs. Information was given on centralized collections (17 o/o of the elementary schools did not have libraries), staffing (38 o/o of the schools had full-time librarians), expenditures (average library expenditure was $2.66 per pupil and the average district per pupil expenditure for audio-visual materials was $1.68), collections (an average of 6.2 books per pupil and "small" audio-visual collections), quarters and equipment ("... audio-visual equipment was present to some extent in all schools, but overhead projectors ... in fewer than one half of the schools."), organization and administration, and programs (although many services were provided, audio-visual services needed to be expanded and improved). Concerning district centers, the survey revealed a need to staff the centers with professional librarians, to expand beyond processing and cataloging, and to provide the newer media.

A conclusion of the National Education Association report on "Planning and Organizing for Teaching" (1963) has major relevance: "In general, the school library, where it exists, is not adequately built into the educational program..." and that the philosophy of the library as an instructional materials center and as a contributing member of the instructional team "... is perceived by relatively few librarians and only dimly by most teachers and administrators."

Status Studies

Various status studies are included here; some are incorporated into later sections. Many status studies exist, too many to be cited usefully here, as in many cases they apply only to a local situation and are reapidly outmoded.

Aside from status studies pertaining to one school or school system, several state-wide surveys have been accomplished. Breiland compiled the New Mexico survey of elementary, junior, and senior high school libraries. New Jersey's investigation of elementary school practices (1963), with a return of 100 o/o of the questionnaires, examined the availability of materials and the per pupil book expenditures, reporting data by classrooms rather than by schools. North Carolina's survey, edited by Downes (1965) and incorporated into a general governor's report on library resources, compared the school libraries, elementary and secondary, to both national and regional standards. Leigh and Crawford's Hawaii survey (1960) reported on the condition of school library development, with recommendations for the future. Ahlers extensive survey (1964) of school libraries and audio-visual materials in the state of Washington, Goodwin and Richardson's Indiana survey (1964), Pennsylvania's 1963 (since updated), the New Jersey Library Development Committee's study (1964) which examined public, academic, vocational, and technical high school libraries in addition to parochial and private, are all examples of status studies of varied comprehensiveness. Another interesting survey is the Catholic Library Association's examination of school libraries (1964).

Three more unusual ones were the surveys of Oregon, New York, and Maryland. Phillips and Laures' study (1962) dealt with Oregon's public libraries, and is unusually interesting in its descriptive "case studies" of public library-public school relationships.

In the New York assessment of school quality (1959), Goodman's purpose was the development of techniques for measuring quality, assuming that "Effectiveness must be measured by how well a system performs in terms of its potential." Various measurement devices were used (socio-economic index, intelligence and achievement tests, number of library books per pupil, and others). Findings included, among others: in certain systems community expectations tended to "... stimulate these systems to outdo themselves..."; "... school systems tend to use additional financial resources for the benefit of the pupils of higher socio-economic status..."; and "There is a correlation of .51 between per pupil expenditure for instructional purposes and composite achievement score at Grade 7... ."

A most interesting and extensive study is that of the Maryland Department of Education (1964). With 100 o/o returns and the limitations clearly stated, this surveyed (1) the status of individual school libraries, (2) central office services, and (3) personnel and budgets. Among the findings were: per pupil library materials expenditures increased 1340 o/o over the 1946-47 school year; 84.6 o/o of the schools had centralized libraries; 50.7 o/o of the libraries had fewer than 3,000 volumnes; and 29.1 o/o of the twenty-four school systems of the state had full-time supervisors.

One of the most comprehensive of regional reports was that of the Pacific Northwest Library Association's (1960) "Elementary and Secondary School Libraries of the Pacific Northwest" (R.L. Darling and others; M. Kroll, editor) on standards, supervision, school and public library relations, and the status of libraries in senior highs, junior-senior highs, and twelve-grade schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools, with conclusions and recommendations in each category.

SCHOOL LIBRARY STANDARDS

This section pertains to the development, establishment, revision, effectiveness, and enforcement of state, regional, and national standards.

Darling's survey of standards (1964) is an updating and expansion of a previous survey, and provides an analysis and comparison of state, regional, and national school library standards, with the influences of each noted and with quotations of states' standards included.

The 1960 "Standards for School Library Programs" has apparently generated an increased interest in standards and in evaluation. One of the outgrowths of the 1960 standards was described by Kennon (1961) in her article on the School Library Development Project. Kennon reported on the implementation of the 1960 standards. These standards were also used in various states and regions as a measurement of the status of school libraries. The Illinois Association of School Librarians in examining standards for that state (1965) proposed a three-phase movement toward meeting the national standards, with a study of existing status as the first step. The Gaver and Velazquez report on Puerto Rican school libraries dealt also, in part, with an evaluation of the libraries, as compared to the 1960 standards. The report is unusual in its survey, followed by a personal investigation, and in the extent of the treatment of the problems. Prostano's dissertation (1962) compared Connecticut's school libraries with the 1960 standards. His study, with a questionnaire based on criteria in the 1960 standards, concluded the comparison showed that "... not only were the percentages of schools meeting the standards exceedingly low, but the percentages of schools actually providing the resources evidenced a rather desperate picture." Prostano further found that: 1.5 o/o of schools of 200-900 pupils and 3.9 o/o of the schools of more than 900 students met the standards for librarian-pupil ratio; 4.9 o/o of the 200-900 pupil schools and 14.6 o/o of schools of 1,000 or more met the minimum book standard; and 64.9 o/o of the schools received various services from public libraries.

Revisions on the 1960 standards were suggested by Henne (1966). She pointed out the major areas needing revision, basing her recommendations on "... suggestions that have been made voluntarily to the writer and also responses made in answer to informal inquiries..." by school librarians, administrators, and others. The major areas were: services; accessibility of materials and services; and system-wide, state, regional, and national planning and cooperative efforts.

When Christine (1966) surveyed extended service in school libraries, she also asked the administrators and school librarians (forty in all) if they would support the 1960 standards. Two of nine administrators and fourteen of twenty-nine librarians answered negatively. The replies (such as, "Adminsitrators refuse to adequately staff now, these standards are ridiculous," "We'd have to move out to make room for the librarians," and "In the realm of never, never land") indicated a gap between the standards and their acceptance by somepracticioners.

Day and Jones, in their 1961 Southern States Work Conference report on quality school library service, described effective library service, patterns of organization, school library supervision, the responsibilities of administrators and faculty members, and the different functions of public and school librarians. Education in library science was also included, and stressed prospective teachers' and administrators' instruction in school libraries and materials and in-service training for school librarians. The report reflects the extensive experience of the participants and the work of the state and regional committees.

Of major importance to the development of elementary school libraries and appropriate standards is the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' work, "Achieving Quality in School Library Service" (1964). This evaluative instrument pointed out the methods, personnel, and ways of reporting in studying school libraries or library systems. Of particular interest are the criteria for evaluation, both the 1960 standards and the Southern Association standards being included. The library was evaluated on the basis of purposes, program, personnel, facilities, budget, collections, school-community interaction, staff responsibilities, coordination, and the like. A percentage of books by subject area and a Book Evaluation Chart was also used.

Jones and McJenkin (1964) described the cooperation between the Standards Committee of the American Association of School Librarians and the Southern Association in implementing the national standards and encouraging the adoption of the Southern Association standards.

Srygley (1964) studied "how nearly certain selective situations approach meeting..." the Southern Association's standards and identified "... a few elementary school libraries in each of the Southern States which seem to have made outstanding progress in school library development... ." Thirty schools were identified by the state school library supervisor and were queried by questionnaire (94.7 o/o return). Detailed information on centralization of libraries, number of librarians, book and magazine budgets, expenditures for other materials, centralized processing, books per pupil, professional materials, audio-visual collections, and the like were reported for each school or school system.

Kennon (1962) commented, with examples, on the trends in elementary school library development and analysed the four common elements of successful efforts by state and local groups to improve elementary school libraries: (1) "focus on the program of services provided..."; (2) "emphasis on cooperative action"; (3) "use of surveys and evaluation of existing programs to identify needs and goals"; and (4) "long-range planning of steps necessary to obtain good ... programs."

Sherman and Faris (1966) described the development of basic and advanced guidelines for the audio-visual field in elementary, secondary, and collegiate level schools (These guidelines were later adopted as standards by the Association of Chief State School Audio-Visual Officers). Self-evaluative instruments concerning (1) the administrative commitment to the media program, (2) curricular and instructional relationships, (3) the center, (4) facilities, (5) budget, and (6) staff were discussed.

Billings (1966) reviewed state, regional, and national standards, commenting particularly on movements to revise the North Central standards. Billings also reported the results of a survey to determine areas of the 1960 standards that were in greatest need of revision (seating capacity, increased budgets and collections, clerical assistance, audio-visual collections, and relations of the school librarian and the audio-visual coordinator) stating, "... the changing role of the library in the educational program of today's schools is calling for an adjustment of school library standards to make them more compatible with the changing teaching procedures, multi-media usage, and mechanical developments."

PATTERNS OF SCHOOL LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL

This section is intended to explore how various types of school libraries are managed, what administrative problems are encountered and how they are solved, and what are the roles and relationships of different librarians and supervisors.

Aside from various textbooks which described in minute detail the workings of the school library and the responsibilities of the school librarian, and articles which portrayed local administrative and managerial practices, information on aspects of school library management might be obtained from certain research. Dorin (1960) assessed the practices of vocational high school libraries in New York City. After completing a list of principles governing the operation of libraries, interviewing selected teachers, specialists, and administrators, and utilizing official reports, Dorin examined the libraries, concluding that in over 50 o/o of the schools libraries were considered as separate departments and in 13 o/o of the schools librarians participated in "cabinet discussions" (as a member of the principal's "cabinet"). Status as a separate department and inclusion in the "cabinet" consituted one of Dorin's major recommendations.

Corbacho's research (1963) is one of the few examinations of the administrative organization of materials centers. The aim of the study was to "... survey, describe, and analyse the administrative organization of selected system instructional materials centers." A sample of two from a universe of eight was selected and studied. Corbacho found that (1) each district and unit needed a coordinating head, (2) authority and responsibility should be defined and understood, (3) predetermined tasks should be assigned to capable employees whose abilities should be utilized to the highest degree, (4) flexibility and cooperation should be built into the operation, (5) routines should be standardized, and (6) others.

Hall (1963) studied two types of organization of instructional materials centers, building and system-wide centers, in an effort to ascertain which type provieded a greater accessibility of materials to elementary school teachers and pupils, concluding that each building should contain instructional materials placed in a building center. Donnelly (1965) attempted to identify problems and practices in staffing, organization and administration, services, facilities, and utilization in selected high school instructional materials centers.

Gross's report (1963) on the administration and organization of children's services in public libraries, noting as it does certain universal applications of management principles. Gross identified administrative and authority patterns and noted the increased effectiveness of the department when it operated under unified authority. Though different types of administration were examined, no one best type was identified nor was there any correlation between a particular type and the success of the children's department.

SCHOOL LIBRARY PERSONNEL

This area is concerned with the education, certification, duties, working conditions, recruitment, background, personality, professional associations, and relationships of persons working in school libraries. This encompasses the school librarian, the non-professional school library worker, the student library assistant, the local school library supervisor, and the state school library supervisor or consultant.

Education

Various studies pointed out the status of the educational preparation of school librarians. McPheeters' mail survey of librarians and administrators of school and public libraries in metropolitan areas (1960) uncovered the fact that 22 o/o of all public library children's librarians and 18 o/o of all school librarians lacked the bachelor's degree. On the master's level, 26 o/o of the public librarians held the master's degree and 16 o/o, the master's in library science; 42 o/o of the school librarians had master's, and 10 o/o held the master's in library science or its equivalent. Lambert's study (1960) of the school librarians in WHO'S WHO IN LIBRARY SCIENCE (1955 edition) recorded that 80 o/o had liberal arts bachelor's, 13 o/o had bachelor's in education, and 10 o/o had a second library science degree. One significant figure noted by Lambert was that 57 o/o of the school librarians had no formal post-bachelor's study, and 8 o/o had no formal training in library science. Vance (1962) concluded that the professional status of school librarians in Michigan had improved, noting areas of improvement as, "the increase in the number of full-time librarians, the attainment of a better formal education with substantial library science training, the meeting of certification requirements and the increased amount of professional experience... ." Vance also discovered some problems in professional education:lack of courses in adolescent literature or selection of non-print materials; lack of practice work; and lack of participation in in-service education.

Lattimer's (1963) opinionaire surveyed the opinions of one hundred persons in New York state and elsewhere (selection procedures not defined) on the educational needs of school librarians, noting an 88 o/o positive response on the requiring of a fifth year degree. Respondents further indicated support for a foreign language requirement, adequate preparation in education courses, practical experience for prospective librarians, and the inclusion in the curriculum of work with non-book materials.

Papers presented at a conference on the "School Library as a Materials Center," edited by Mahar (1963), discussed current problems in education for librarianship and contained not only descriptions of current curricula but also a report by Lohrer on the implications of the instructional materials concept. Gaver commented on the responsibilities of accredited library schools and the possible accreditation of single-purpose schools, while Henne noted, "... the movement toward a 6-year program, instead of 5, as an optimum professional sequence for many, perhaps most, librarians."

Danton (1959) pointed out the scarcity of dissertations in school librarianship, stating that only one school librarian with a doctorate was actually working in a school library.

Henne (1966) discussed, in "As Good as Librarians Make Them," the programs for continuing education in the Title XI NDEA Institutes.

Condit and Sharp (1964) described an in-service course in library resources for classroom enrichment for elementary and junior high school teachers and librarians. Evaluated by a questionnaire, the course was judged to be superior or above average by most of the participants. Identified as the most helpful aspects of the course were: choral speaking; helping children interpret literature; illustrating books; and writing children's books. Identified as the major omissions were: mythology; story-telling; Negro Folklore; library skills; the reluctant reader; and recordings.

An interesting study by Scuorzo (1961) in an allied field pointed out the lack of preparation in the selection, evaluation, use, cataloging and administration of audio-visual and other instructional materials for persons designated as "Audio Visual Materials Building Coordinators."

Scarcity and Recruitment

The NEA study of personnel administration in urban school districts (1963) reported, "The percents of ... librarians assigned to elementary schools were much lower in small districts than in the marge. Only two of the positions identified separately - counselors and librarians - show a completely consistent variation with size of school district. Higher percents of men were employed as ... librarians in the small districts than in large."

The National Education Association reported (1962) on professional staffing ratios in two groups of cities: Group I, cities of 500,000 or more; Group II, cities of 100,000 to 499,999. One aspect of the report recorded the numbers of librarians and the numbers per 1,000 pupils for elementary, junior high, senior high, and all schools. In the all-schools category only one city of Group I had one librarian per 1,000 students, and seventeen in Group II, fourteen of the seventeen being in Southern states.

Wright's and Greer's survey (1963), confined to the junior high school, found that in schools of less than 300 pupils, although 80 o/o had a central library, only slightly more than half had the services of a librarian. In larger schools "... approximately one-sixth of the junior and one-twelfth of the junior-senior high schools had no such service."

A major study of library needs, undertaken by the American Library Association and entitled, NATIONAL INVENTORY OF LIBRARY NEEDS(1965), reported the then current deficiencies in school librarianship. Professional school librarians were defined in two different ways. The first definition was that of the school librarian who had six or more hours of library science. In comparing the number of such school librarians with the number required to meet the STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS, a deficiency of 79,100 school librarians was found. In comparing the number of school librarians with fifteen or more hours in library science training (the second definition), a gap of 87,000 was found between the actual number of school librarians and those required to meet the standards.

Distribution of school librarians in WHO'S WHO IN LIBRARY SERVICE (1955 edition) was briefly portrayed by Lambert (1960). Geographically, the librarians were distributed in forty-six of the then forty-eight states, with approximately one-third of the states represented by more than twenty-five librarians, and with California the greatest "debtor" state, i.e., the difference between the state of birth and the state of employment. Most of the librarians were employed in secondary schools. No senior high school librarians were listed from three states; no junior high school librarians, from eighteen states; no elementary school librarians, from twenty-five states.

In a dissertation on factors which influenced school librarians to select school librarianship as a career, McCreedy (1963) found the influential factors were the enjoyment of books, liking for young people, interest in young people's books, and a desire for intellectually stimulating work. School librarians stated that their experience as a student assistant in a school library was important, as were their experiences in "good school school libraries with active programs of service" and with full-time librarians. Many librarians also entered this career from teaching, a majority having been assigned the school library as an additional duty.

Salary studies were reported principally by the National Education Association. In a 1963 report on salary schedule provisions in school systems of 25,000 or more pupils, in which twenty-eight of thirty-seven systems reported data for school librarians, it was found that in nineteen systems school librarians were on the same salary schedule as teachers. In nine systems either there was an independent schedule or a differential above the teachers' schedule for school librarians. In a comparison of salary schedule minimum and top maximum provisions in 1958-59 and 1962-63, it was noted that the per cent of increase of average minimum salaries was 21, and the per cent of increase of average top maximum salaries was 23.3.

The N.E.A. reported in its examination of the economic status of teachers in 1964-65 that the average salary for all school librarians in 1964-65 was $6,721.00, 9.4 o/o higher than for 1963-63. In systems of 25,000 or more students, the salaries of school librarians and classroom teachers was almost the same, while in smaller systems school librarians' salaries were more, averaging $500-$600 more.

McPheeters' study (1960) reported the median salaries of children's librarians in public libraries as $4,710 and of school librarians as $5,700.

It should be noted that in computing the "dollar gap" in school librarians' salaries, the NATIONAL INVENTORY OF LIBRARY NEEDS used a minimum average salary of $6,000, quoting a N.E.A. study on the economic status of teachers, 1963-1964.

Supervision

Lattimer (1964) surveyed the status, functions, and practices of local school library supervisors in New York state. Though limited by the slection of the sample and the questionnaire design, and the selection of the sample, this presents information on supervisors' tasks. Conclusions on areas in which effective programs could be strengthened included: more action research on the library' contribution to the school; staff orientation to libraries; outlines of the role expectations of supervisors; greater awareness by supervisors of the changing nature of education and its effects; recruitment and in-service training of librarians; and others.

The Mahar report (1966) of a 1964 conference on school library supervision in large cities was a compilation of the conference addresses, the subjects of which were school libraries in urban education, integration of the curriculum and supervision, services to the culturally deprived and the gifted, personnel, financial support, and general recommendations for future action. One particularly interesting section contained descriptions of how school library supervisors were working with the problems of school libraries in urban education - from the organizational pattern in New York City and the experimental curricula in Pittsburgh to the concern for attitude change in Los Angeles.

The study on school libraries of the Pacific Northwest (1960), edited by Kroll, also reported on the extent and type of supervision at the state and provincial and local levels. Based on official documents, interviews, observation, and questionnaires, it was found that no state or provincial department of education had a full-time school library specialist on its staff and that local systems varied widely in providing supervision (normally by general administrators or supervisors, a school library supervisor, or a librarian in one system responsible for more than one library). In most of the schools supervision of the school libraries was the responsibility of either general administrators or general supervisors. Those systems having a full-time library supervisor noted a closer coordination between the library and the curriculum. Over half of the library programs were supervised by regular librarians who had part-time supervisory responsibility. The principal advantage of this was identified as the achievement of unity and planning within a system; the major disadvantage, as the division of attention given both to supervision and to the individual library. This particular study is one of the few which provides information on the status and contributions of school library supervisors.

Other

McPheeters' account (1960) described the movement of librarians from public library to school library work and vice versa, noting that an approximately equal exchange took place, and that public librarians were not drawn to school librarianship because of salary or working conditions.

Descriptions of work week, scheduling, extra-curricular assignments, unscheduled periods and the like were contained in the 1959 National Education Association analysis of conditions of work.

Winters' dissertation (1962) was an attempt "... to differentiate the interests of male librarians from those of men-in-general and to establish an occupational scale for male librarians," as a part of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank.

Reports of job satisfaction on the part of school librarians found in McPheeters (1960), Vance (1963) and the McCreedy study (1963) had relevancy to this area.

COLLECTIONS

This section is concerned with the general and special collections of materials in school libraries, and the problems attendant.

As noted in the NATIONAL INVENTORY OF LIBRARY NEEDS (1965), the collections in centralized school libraries, when measured against the STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS, revealed a gap of 233,424,000 volumes. The present collections, then, were less than half of the number required to meet the standards.

A portion of STUDENT USE OF LIBRARIES (1964) contains a paper by F.L. Schick and others on the resources for student use. This not only noted the vast increases in publication and population, but also reported on the availability of resources in public, college, and school libraries. The report noted "... the grave conditions existing in our public school libraries... ." Data on resources was taken from a 1960-61 survey of public school libraries (U.S. Office of Education) and from a questionnaire to twenty-five communities selected because of their geographic location, size of the institution, and amount of statistical information available. Public school library resources and services were influenced by two identified factors (an increase in enrollment and curricular changes in various facets of the schools' programs) and were examined on the basis of : (1) estimated per cent of the total instructional budget allotted to school libraries; (2) per pupil expenditures for library books; (3) size of secondary school collections; (4) employment of full-time librarians; (5) extended hours of service. Assuming a level of 3 o/o of the total instructional budget is required to provide average service, the report noted that only two of the twenty-four systems allocated 4 o/o or more. Only one system reached the recommended per pupil expenditure (STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS), and five of the major school systems of the United States (Baltimore, Boston, New Orleans, New York City, and Philadelphia) operated on school library budgets of less than 15 o/o of that recommended to meet the standards. In none of these five systems did the book collection meet standards. Only two of the twenty-four had ten or more books per pupil. Although most of the systems had full-time librarians in all the secondary schools, systems such as Baltimore, Boston, Des Moines, New York City, and Philadelphia did not. Seven of the twenty-four systems indicated some night service (one of the seven had one high school with Saturday service), but the number of schools with such service in a school system was small(New York City, 17 of 220; Chicago, 9 of 51). Thus, it appears almost impossible to disagree with the statement, "... in five major cities almost all of the public secondary school libraries are equipped to provide only a fraction of the materials and services which today's high schools require." If the conditions in elementary schools follow the typical pattern, it can be assumed that the level of support there is considerably smaller than that for secondary schools.

The collection of materials, especially books, has been dealt with many times, particularly as portions of status studies. Some studies have attempted to analyse book collections and to demonstrate the special characteristics of various collections. The McCusker dissertation (1963) hypothesized and generally found that elementary schools without central libraries lacked comprehensive book collections. Egoff and Gibson (1963) analysed the print collections of school libraries of New Westminster, with recommendations for strengthening collections.

Certain special aspects of the print collections were also studied. Conferences, books, and articles on the use of paperbacks were reported. Bogart (1965) commented on the use of paperback books in fifty New Jersey schools, recommending an expenditure of $2.00 per elementary school pupil and $4.00 per secondary student, and increasing accessibility through classroom as well as library collections. Urell's study of the use of paperbacks in high school literature classes provided information on the physical durability of the book, and also on attitudes toward use of paperbacks of students (75 o/o preferred paperbacks), parents (60 o/o favorable), and teachers (favorable enought to justify experimenting with their use). Bruell gave an account of one Illinois school's adoption of paperback books to replace anthologies in high school English. In two Colorado senior high school English classes, one class was taught the traditional way and one had a planned reading program, with a classroom collection of paperbacks (Rioux, 1962). The rate of reading of the research group increased two to one over the control group. Further research, expanded throughout a junior-senior high school for one semester, found an increased interest in reading, with inconclusive statistical findings on differences in pre- and post-tests. Rioux identified reasons for purchasing paperback library books (based on an eigthteen months' experience)as: (1) encouragement of student reading; (2) attractiveness to the reluctant reader; (3) encouragement of students' personal libraries; (4) provision for adequate duplication of titles; (5) expendability; (6) low replacement cost; (7) low-cost expansion of book resources; (8) paperback influence in increasing the use of hardbacks; (9) attitude change of the faculty. Grogan (1962) portrayed her experience in the attraction of paperbacks to vocational high school students.

Project Discovery (Muller, 1965) was designed to test educational change produced by saturating schools with audio-visual equipment and materials and to discover the effects of maximum availability of materials on teaching, learning, and attitudes. An attempt at measuring the capability for kinds of instruction in schools was the National Education Association's "Studies in the Growth of Instructional Technology, I." Based on the assumption that the increased provision of ausio- visual materials and equipment is "...one of the preconditions for a technological revolution in education...," this studied the growth of audio-visual equipment in the schools, noting that the motion picture was the principal audio-visual tool until the mid-1950's when the newer media began to be introduced more generally. Further information in audio-visual materials and their utilization in schools and libraries may be found in the section, Aims and Objectives, and in various status studies.

In addition to sections in status studies concerning the quantity and title distribution of magazine collections, the Koste dissertation (1962) established criteria for evaluating the quality and children's magazines and assessed the value of existing magazines, none of which met all the criteria. Studies concerned with collections in special fields or subject areas may also be found. The National Education Association research monograph on facilities for science and mathematics teaching concluded, after a questionnaire survey with a 31.3 o/o return, that, for example, almost 25 o/o of the respondents reported inadequate science reference materials. An Office of Education bulletin (1960) reported, in part, on a survey of materials on the United Nations in nine American school systems having a school library supervisor. All libraries contained book and periodical material, and supervisors indicated needs for additional materials.

An interesting, though limited, study by Sabadosh (1965) was intended to ascertain how libraries and librarians were responding to the new media and the new teaching methods. Four prominent high schools and their libraries were selected and examined. On the basis of a general discussion of materials centers and of the examination of the selected libraries, the investigator concluded that the new teaching methods implied for school libraries: the need for larger, broader collections, with more duplication; larger library staffs with varied interests and backgrounds; and increased library space, designed for greater flexibility.

BUDGETS AND BUSINESS PRACTICES

This area is devoted to the problems of the school library budget, its adequacy, planning, controlling, and allocating, and the various business practices and records of school libraries.

Much information concerning per pupil expenditures for books, other print materials, and audio-visual materials can be found in various status studies, or as portions of other studies.

Two publications of the American Library Association treat budgets or budgetary needs. The "National Inventory of Library Needs" (1965) pointed out that the 1964 expenditure for books of public schools with centralized libraries was 59 o/o of the standard of $4.00 per pupil and 39 o/o of the standard of $6.00 per pupil, with a total dollar gap of over 47 million dollars between the 1964 expenditures and the standard of $4.00 per pupil and over 106 million dollars, of $6.00 per pupil. It was estimated that the amount needed by school libraries to bring the collections up to standard, to maintain them, and to provide professional staff was 1.37 billion dollars (at the $4.00 standard) or 1.47 billion (at the $6.00 standard). The report on the availability of resources in "Student Use of Libraries" (1964) noted "... it is probably true that at least 3 percent of the total instructional budget is necessary to provide average school library service." Of the twenty-four school systems surveyed, two budgeted four or more per cent for school libraries.

Ziskind (1958) surveyed budgeting principles and practices of 375 schools in varying size communities in every state, with fairly similar questions for librarians and administrators (33 1/3 o/o return), and later conversed with administrators and librarians on the results. Although this preceded the 1960 standards, it noted the practice of basing budgets on the various state, regional, and national standards (particularly enrollment). Zizkind commented, "Need is always in the background of budget making but proper emphasis upon the actual requirements of a library requires a detailed evaluation by the librarian acquainted with his books and facilities, his school, his faculty, and his student body."

Bothwell studied the current "small item expenditures" (divided into three categories: Quality Improvement, which included library books and audio-visual supplies; Quality Related; and Basic) of seventy-one school districts of the Associated Public School Systems, selected for research purposes by P.R. Mort. Among the findings were: "small item expenditures" were found to be a vital factor in achieving quality education; and an increase in general per pupil expenditures usually resulted in an increase in Quality Improvement expenditures.

ACCESSIBILITY AND USE

This section is devoted to the use made of the library by administrators, teachers, and students, and to the library's accessibility, including extended hours, restraints imposed by traditional study hall and student control measures, flexible scheduling, problems of bus-transported students, and the like.

Accessibility and use of elementary school libraries are the subjects of several studies. McCusker (1963) studied the availability of materials in elementary schools without centralized libraries. The purpose of Hall's dissertation (1963) was to ascertain which of two types of organization of instructional materials centers (a system-wide center or school-building centers) gave greater access to materials in the lementary school. Hall found that provision for pupil use of the system-wide center was "... not evident... and seldom exists among individual elementary school materials centers," and that teacher use was principally dependent on accessibility, with distance and adequate time also being important.

Two articles described elementary school programs of unscheduled library periods. Williams (1965) portrayed the advantages of unscheduled periods to a Chicago school. Flexibility in scheduling at Indiana University's elementary school was pictured by Wert and Pell (1965) who evaluated the experience. They noted that as teachers came to accept the pupils' individual use of the library, flexibility in scheduling increased.

Several studies of secondary schools have been accomplished. McWilliams (1959) scrutinized school library use by above-average, average, and below-average juniors in three senior high schools, determining the purposes of use and the factors encouraging or discouraging use. Above-average students tended not to use the school library because of "... lack of time, school activities, preference for study hall..., and the inadequacy of the library." More below-average students reported visiting the library everyday "... to read the newspaper, to study where quiet, to spread out work, to be near friends, to get out of study hall..." and others. Generally, as the number of library visits increased, so also did the less serious purposes of the students. Some 16 % of the students reported that library use was unnecessary in the preparation of assignments. In this study it appeared that major school library use was not by the above-average student.

Ducat (1960) studied student and faculty use in three secondary schools, with data from questionnaires, records of actual use, and a supplementary in-depth study of students in one school. Ducat found that: (1) teachers vary widely in their opinions of the importance of library materials; (2) "Only a small percentage of the total student enrollment makes regular and frequent visits to the school library"; (3) students of lesser ability make less use of the library than do students of greater ability. Ducat concluded that her study " ... provide(d) little evidence that the school library plays a vital role in the total school programs of the schools investigated, "due partially to the absence of leadership by administrators and, in certain subjects, to the lack of motivation to use school library materials and the lack of programs requiring the use of many types of materials.

One interesting study, limited by the statistical treatment, incompleteness of data, and lack of stated purpose, was that of Hartz (1964). A questionnaire was administered to 3,872 of 9,541 students and 89 of 461 teaching faculty in eight high schools concerning their use of the library in one school day. 41 o/o of all the students used the library some time during the day, with 52 o/o of this number using it to return, renew, or charge out books or to study their own books. Only 28 o/o were engaged in a type of independent study. 19 o/o of the teachers used the library, but only 12 o/o used it for academic purposes. Thus, it would appear that the school library was not extensively used by either group. "However," the author stated, " the study is not necessarily typical of the use of the library on other days. .... But I do not believe the conclusions drawn from this one-day study would be altered to any great degree."

Among various ideas to increase the accessibility of school libraries is the extension of hours. Howell (1965) reported a survey of California school libraries, indicating 8 o/o of the high schools with night service, 7 o/o of the high schools contemplating such service, and a scattering of elementary schools open at night. In evaluating night service 55 o/o of the administrators and librarians reported excellent to good success; 45 o/o reported fair to poor success. Where night service had not been successful and had been discontinued, reasons for discontinuance were identified: 71 o/o, insufficient student use; 15 o/o, lack of funds for personnel; 8 o/o , lack of personnel; 3 o/o, inadequate materials; and 3 o/o, discipline problems. Factors influencing success were: librarian on duty; adequate collection; clerical assistance; adequate lighting of grounds and the presence of a custodian.

Although Howell (1965) reported discipline to be important in discontinuance of night service by only 3 o/o, the survey of Christine (1966) of forty selected administrators and librarians in certain California schools found that school librarians were opposed to extending or providing night service principally because of the discipline problems inherent in night openings.

A major study in encouraging library use which has important implications not only to college libraries but also to school libraries is the Monteith Project reported by Patricia Knapp (1961). Designed to be "an experiment in coordination between the library and teaching staff to change student use of the library," and to encourage development of the student's ability to do independent study, this project explored librarian-teacher relationships, a more active role of librarians in the total teaching situation, and the evolvement of a library-integrated curriculum. The project developers believed that if the librarians took part in the initial planning of the course work they might assist in developing "... a program in which the student's competence in the use of the library broadened as he moved from subject field to subject field, deepened as he moved from class level to class level, and in which the contribution of the library to learning was fully manifest." Not only were library experiences deliberately inserted into the undergraduate curriculum, but bibliographic assistants, under the direction of a project librarian, were also assigned to faculty members.

The work of the Monteith Project was based on the belief that students needed actually to use the library to attain competency, that their use had to be connected definitely with course work, and that through cooperation with the faculty library experiences could be built into the curriculum. Knapp stated, "The primary objective of our research, therefore, was to focus our attention firmly upon the relations between faculty and librarians as they changed and developed through the two years of the Pilot Project." The project was evaluated on the basis of three types of data: observational notes; interview transcriptions; and transcriptions of reminiscences. Four characteristics were identified as contributing to the development of the project: (1) dual role pattern; (2) concept of social distance; (3) the divisional organization and group allegiance; (4) ambivalence between roles. Each of these affacted the project and its organization. This particular project is noteworthy in its attempts to increase student library competence through teacher-librarian cooperation and also in its use of the research techniques and viewpoints of sociology.

Several studies on teacher use of libraries have been done. The Perkins report (1965) tested the knowledge of library fundamentals of 4,710 college seniors in teacher training institutions, using three different tests. Perkins found that, "No evidence was gained ... to contradict the hypothesis that prospective teachers, as a group, cannot make intelligent use of library facilities."

Gaver's article on teacher education and school libraries (1966) was based on a study designed to discover to what extent teachers and administrators were "... acquainted with the nature, function, and effective use of the school library in classroom teaching and in the total educational program" and "... the evaluation, selection, and use of teaching materials of all kinds." A survey of 1,209 institutions of higher education (32 o/o usable return) was conducted. With the background of this and similar studies, Gaver concluded that many teacher training institutions lacked the resources to acquaint students with libraries and teaching materials and that many teachers lacked an understanding of the library's role in education.

Another report ("Current and Future Use of New Media in Teacher Education," 1965) has implications on the teachers' use of materials. The project, Teacher Education and Media (TEAM) Project, surveyed teacher training institutions preparing elementary and secondary teachers to discover to what extent the new media was utilized in the preparation of prospective teachers. 38 o/o of the over 600 replying institutions stated that no instructional media courses were offered. The media most often used in teaching by the education faculty were sound motion pictures, silent filmstrips, and transparencies, while programed instruction and radio and television broadcasts were the least used. Although most respondents reported no restrictions on the acceptance of educational technology, restrictions, where they existed, were listed in order: "... lack of money, lack of or poor quality of available materials, lack of time, lack of familiarity with materials and the value of technology...," and others. Thus, it would seem that prospective teachers may have limited exposure to the newer media.

An interesting segment of the Cianciolo dissertation (1963) dealt with the criteria she established to determine the accessibility of trade books in elementary school programs. Significant factors in accessibility Cianciolo found to be "... location of the book collection, the professional preparation and efficiency of the library personnel, the availability of funds, circulation practices, a summer school library program, and the relationship between the public library and the school."

TECHNICAL PROCESSES

This area is concerned with the technical processes of school libraries, including acquisition, cataloging, processing, circulating, and the like, and with the centralization of services and processes. Information concerning technical processes in school libraries may also be found in the general technical literature and in that of other types of libraries where problems in technical processes may be similar to those in school libraries.

Reflecting a major interest of school librarians are the various studies on centralization, with centralized cataloging, processing, and other services. Slack (1964) examined centralized and cooperative school library systems, surveying the existing school libraries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints' school system, certain centralized systems in California, and the library system of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. After commenting on the various systems surveyed and their experiences, Slack stated that centralized processing was feasible and efficient when most of the materials were commonly ordered by member libraries. Huddleston's thesis (1956) aimed at analysing the types of centralization in school libraries and indicating the strengths and weaknesses. Following a literature search, consultations with specialists, and visits to various centers, Huddleston found that centralized services appeared to attain greater economy and efficiency, to expand services and collections, and, at times, to separate the library from the local school and local control. The investigator pointed out the advantages of centralization: maintenance of model collections; cataloging; acquisition; assistance to local schools; provision for supplementary materials; union catalogs; inter-library loans; advisory services; and improved liaison with other agencies.

Coburn (1961) investigated the then present status of cataloging in New York City's elementary schools and centralized cataloging procedures, formulating a plan for centralization, with proposed operations and estimated costs. The proposal included objectives, personnel, equipment and supplies, space requirements, and work processes. Lively (1962) described the Madison, Wisconsin public schools' center which handled ordering, cataloging, physical preparation, delivery, mending, and preparation for the bindery. Lively pointed out the time and money saved, and noted that "... uniformity and accuracy in classifying and cataloging are achieved with centralized processing."

Among the various descriptions of centralized cataloging and processing is that of the Baltimore public schools by Wiese (1961). She portrayed first the background, establishment, and the workings of the center, and included information on the volume of work and costs, and conclusions on the advantages and disadvantages. An average of 2,400 books per month were cataloged and processed (9,660 in one peak month), excluding books acquired from non-central office funds. To compare time and costs in cataloging, school librarians were asked to study the time spent in cataloging and processing twenty-five books using Wilson cards and twenty-five books where all cards had to be typed. From eleven to twenty minutes were spent on each book having Wilson cards and thirteen to twenty-nine minutes on the other group. Cataloging and processing costs per book (Wilson cards) was \$.79 - \$1.35, and \$.84 - \$1.83 per book when cards were typed. Wiese identified the advantages of centralized cataloging and processing as: (1) better quality, uniformity, consistency, completeness, and accuracy in cataloging and classification; (2) elimination of problems created by inexperienced or new personnel; (3) release of librarians from routine tasks to devote time to professional tasks, with a consequent improvement in librarian morale; (4) reduced time required to prepare books; (5) familiarized students, teachers, and librarians who move from one school to another with a uniform system; (6) eliminated the hiring of clerical persons for each library; (7) saved storage space in the individual libraries; (8) made basic collections for new schools more quickly available; (9) kept catalogs up-to-date; (10) provided for expansion of services to include ausio-visual materials. Among the disadvantages were (1) librarians might not devote time to familiarizing themselves with the new books, (2) some librarians wanted changes in classification and subject headings, (3) some librarians believed it took longer to get books prepared for circulation when centralization was used, and (4) cross references were not quickly included in some catalogs. Wiese concluded, " Centralized cataloging is providing the librarian with a more efficient tool for locating and using library resources and with more time to render professional services."

Auld (1964) analysed the manual system of compiling orders for school libraries at the Hawaii Department of Education centralized processing center, and described the conversion to punched cards. This change provided an efficient method of ordering materials and provided information: tabulation by individual school funds, by purchase order, and by title; a four-part order form (one part of which was sent to the cataloging section for pre-cataloging); and a detail card.

Aceto's report (1964) of the New York Library Association School Libraries Section's survey of twenty school systems in New York operating central processing centers examined, by questionnaire, the reasons for establishing the centers, staff, facilities, services, and problems. Aceto noted the most usual reason for establishing central processing was lack of adequate staff, a problem which was apparently then transferred to the centers. In only a few cases were preliminary studies on costs and organizational patterns done before the centers were initiated, and no center reported any complete time and cost study after the initiation. Aceto stated, " Processing 'overkill' is found in all the centers to some degree. Such antiquated operations as shellacking... and use of the accession record reflect an unhealthy and costly concern with 'busy work' and a lack of thoughtful analysis of all operations to determine the basic requirements of an effective and efficient system."

Problems in cataloging concerned Jones, Watt, Wolfe, and others. Watt (1962) portrayed the classification scheme she developed for elementary and secondary textbooks and supplementary materials in the Educational Materials Laboratory of the Office of Education. M.L. Jones (1965) described the classification system for children's books used by the Toronto Public Libraries, pointing out the difficulties encountered by children advancing to other libraries and the problems involved in fitting some of the newer children's books into such a system. Werner (1957) and Fatka (1958) reported ways of cutting cataloging costs. Lowrey and Hicks" time study (1959) on school library cataloging, though limited by the design, was an attempt to ascertain the time librarians spent in clerical duties and the average time concumed in cataloging a book. Voss's dissertation (1964) on standard times for certain clerical routines of technical processing commonly used in different types of libraries, though not precisely aimed at school libraries, provided information on standard times for clerical tasks.

The acquisition of school library materials is another subject of interest. Becker (1965) investigated the acquisition practices of Pennsylvania's regional instructional materials centers, finding member districts did not fully participate in acquisition procedures which were dominated by regional center directors and that procedures for the evaluation of possible purchases were incomplete.

Paige, after commenting on the red tape and unusual procedures in school library book ordering (1964), surveyed (1965) school library systems in in towns and cities of various sizes to discover the kinds of services the libraries were receiving from book suppliers. Approximately half the respondents reported that the bid system to secure a wholesaler was not used. The reuirements of smaller libraries were more likely to be met than those of the larger ones. Paige also described the practices of larger systems of breaking up large orders. She reported that 40 o/o of the respondents stated their rate of cancellation by suppliers was 2 o/o or less. Five library systems in cities of over 100,000 noted 90 o/o or more delivery in thirty days, but other places reported 25 o/o, 30 o/o, and 40 o/o delivery in thirty days. Only one librarian indicated dissatisfaction with the service.

Burns (1962) described a predetermined buying formula, using school library books as one example of ordering in unknown quantities and securing the best discounts by estimating the total book order, classifying the books into general discount rates, and securing bids.

The management of audio-visual materials has also received some attention. Pressler (1965) reported on a junior high school's organization of slides, phonograph records, tapes, overhead projectuals, and mounted pictures, and especially the cataloging, filing, and book catalogs for them. Mahoney (1963) described the consolidation (cataloging and circulating) of elementary school films and filmstrips into a central film library. The use of IBM cards and catalogs for film cataloging in the Wichita public schools was portrayed by Wolfe (1963).

Problems in circulation were generally dealt with in publications (e.g., Fry study) on different types of libraries. Some work entirely confined to school libraries has been done. Fix's method (1964) of using flow process charting and the timing of operations in a circulation system was an interesting example of a technique of examining and redesigning a procedure.

Automation of information services and technical processes by machine operations as applied specifically to school libraries has received some attention, though principally of a purely descriptive nature. The National Education Association publication, edited by Bushnell (1964), included, along with material on automated scheduling and computer-based instructional systems, a section describing information retrieval systems of possible use in schools and school libraries.

PUBLICITY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

This area is intended not only to cover the methods used by school librarians to publicize the services and collections of their libraries, but also to examine the attitudes of administrators, teachers, students, non-school librarians, and the community toward school libraries.

The attitudes of administrative personnel in schools, or factors influencing attitudes, were presented by Itamura, Mack, and Davenport. Itamura (1949) examined twenty-two textbooks on secondary school administration published after 1900 to observe the type, presentation, and space allotment of materials on school libraries and to trace the change in emphasis on school libraries. Itamura noted an average of about ten pages on school libraries per book, with stress on the role of the library and the requirement of a trained librarian, and with two trends identified (higher qualifications for the librarian and extended periodical collections). The investigator discovered "... probably only 5 or 6 books appear to be of outstanding and exceptional quality on the discussion of the high school library" and "there are only a few very outstanding books which would enlighten our secondary school administrators about the high school library."

The purpose of Mack's dissertation (1957) was to analyse the content of certain educational periodicals normally available and of interest to school administrators to ascertain the kinds of information on school libraries, published in a one year period, that they contained. Mack was particularly interested in their coverage of the library's contributions to the school's educational program. Only eleven of the 1,561 articles dealt specifically with school libraries, and, in the area of instruction, the greatest stress was on the library's contribution to language arts. Among Mack's conclusions were: (1) school librarians have not written sufficiently on their specialty for the periodicals; (2) little attention was given to the library's contributions to some curricular or co-curricular areas; (3) the library's relationship to other services and agencies was inadequately covered; and (4) material on administrative provisions for services (except quarters) was limited.

Davenport's study (1962), though limited by a very small sample and by the social desirability factor which well might have influenced her questionnaire, was an attempt to determine the attitudes and practices of school principals regarding the school library. This study demonstrated the favorable attitudes of twenty school principals from a limited geographic area.

Woodward (1961) discussed practices of school libraries and librarians as factors affecting the creation of a congenial climate within the library and the school, and questioned each of such practices.

GUIDANCE FUNCTIONS

This area is concerned with the librarian's role in reading and personal guidance, and the relationships between the library and the guidance department in schools. It also is intended to examine the effectiveness of the library in providing special materials, such as occupational information, to individual or groups of students.

Certain research has furnished background information on the guidance functions of the librarian. Hajda's inquiry (1963) of pre-conditional factors of adults' reading was an attempt to ascertain what influences persons to become life-time readers. Among Hajda's findings were: "... reading of books in adolescence tends to be more important than reading books during childhood (except early childhood)..."; "... educational achievement is more than twice as important as reading books in childhood (except early childhood) and about a third as important as reading non-assigned books in adolescence"; "private exchange of books is ... three times as important as history of using school or other library"; and "an attachment to books that lasts for life is more likely to depend on parental family than on the school."

A highly interesting study which concerned a previously untouched area was the Berninghausen and Faunce (1964) exploration of juvenile delinquency and the reading of sensational books. Matching two groups of delinquent and non-delinquent boys, and administering a checklist test and re-test, and conducting a personal interview with each, the investigators found no significant differences in the groups for the number in each group reading "Sensational Books" or "Boys' Books," but did find a significantly greater number of delinquents reading "Adult Books." Though the authors noted serious limitations to the study, they concluded that no relationship between delinquencu and reading sensational books could be inferred.

Willis (1962) identified the differing factors between two groups of matched seventh grade student who did not have significant differences in intelligence, grades, or social distance scores, but who did differ in reading for personal use. He found many differentiating factors such as personal, interpersonal, and family-cultural origins, and pointed out "... the most important factor differentiating extended from non-extended readers was the variation in self-concept."

In an investigation to determine reading preferences of seventh and eighth grade students, to examine their voluntary reading, and to discover how reading preferences were related to differences in intelligence and attainment, Sizemore (1962) concluded that the study was "... in agreement with other investigations in suggesting the importance of continued guidance in reading by parents, teachers, and librarians...," and in the need for balanced collections in home and school libraries, with books of varying difficulty for boys and girls.

Several studies rela d to elementary school children were also found. McCrac n (1966) noted the necessity for providing advanced read g materials for young pupils, in his study of children wh were reading when they entered first grade. Bishop (1963) amined the exper nces (of elementary school childre   centralized libraries) which facilitated or retarded r ing and learning. Among Bishop's conclusions were: the lib ian was one of the critical influencing elements; and "librarian's influence on the outcomes of the library ex ience were due to: (a) her ability and willingness to lp children to locate materials; (b) her efforts toward hel g children to learn efficient library usage; (c) her rea ons to and methods of controlling the children's conduct; (d er efforts to inform the children of the contents of the lib y; (e) her interest in the children's personal needs problems." Martin (1955) reported the conclusions of tudy of what books meant to children in a story hour i public library: identification with the book characters; mulation of imagination; extension of personal experi e; sharing of personal reactions; and determination of accep le behavior.

The role of the libr and the librarian in the guidance program was also co idered. Dane (1961) discussed reading guidance by librari in elementary schools, and noted efforts to assist pup in meeting needs and mastering developmental tasks. Guidar counselors in selected American schools were queried by Warner (1963) to determine what contributions school librarians made to personal, academic, and vocational guidance. Warner stated that "... much remains to be done if the librarian is to be effective as a co-worker in guidance," school librarians need to secure more training in guidance, and guidance workers should take more responsibility in providing in-service education in guidance for other members of the faculty.

Studies on the teachers' participation in reading guidance and in the activities of the school library also have a bearing. El-Hagrasy (1961) tested and demonstrated that there was a "... measurable relationship between (1) teachers' reading habits and library backgrounds (as predictors) and (2) pupils' reading and library skills (as criteria)." In Blick and Ormsbee's discussion of secondary school science programs in Connecticut, the authors evaluated the effects on school libraries of a program placing science materials and equipment in schools. In those schools where student achievement improved and interest increased, the science materials had been made an integral part of the curriculum and the "... teacher ... recognized that he must guide, inform, and 'motivate' his students in the effective use of the materials.

LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

This area deals with various programs of instruction in the use of the library, the articulation of instruction, specialized programs, and effective teaching devices and techniques.

School librarians are often faced with the problems of instruction in the use of the library and with cooperative efforts fostering the development of independent study skills. Library instruction in many school systems begins with early elementary grades and continues through college. Various studies and research reports having a bearing on library instruction have been accomplished.

One series of studies on independent study in elementary schools was the Shaker Heights experiment reported by Krohn, Helfrich, and Emery. The purpose of the three-year project was to teach students in fourth, fifth, and sixth grades work study skills and to develop independent study habits, with the hypothesis being "... that children can learn without the teacher being present, as they were given access to many materials, motivation, and skill to look for their answers themselves - and then left on their own," according to Krohn (1965). Sixteen basic lessons in library skills were presented by the librarian, in large-group instruction, and reinforced by teachers and librarians. Later refinements included involvement of teachers and librarians in the presentation, changes in the basic lessons, pretests, released time for independent activites for students demonstrating competency through the pretests, and the development of a curriculum guide.

Emery (1962, 1963, 1964, 1965) reported on the Shaker Heights experiment comparing two experimental and two control schools and utilizing the Iowa Work-Study Skills Test, the Nationwide Library Skills Examination, and a test of independent study skills, and, additionally, a consultant-observer, librarian-consultants, and a study of pupil, teacher, and parental attitudes. Emery noted that the objective tests did not in all cases favor the experimental schools, but that there was subjective data indicating favorable parental and teacher attitudes and increased independence of student study habits.

Bonn (1960) synthesized and evaluated the literature on training in the use of the library, not confined to one type of library. In Stull's dissertation (1962) a framework for viewing the teaching of elementary school reference reading and a handbook for teachers was developed. Gengler (1965) examined the differences between sixth grade students' ability to apply selected problem solving skills, one group being instructed by a classroom teacher and one group receiving additional instruction by a school librarian. She found a significantly higher mean in schools where additional instruction was conducted by the school librarian. A study in instruction in the use of encyclopedias and in reading guidance, the purpose of which was to examine the effectiveness of a library program for low achievers (a group having a mean intelligence quotient of sixty-four on the Binet), was described by G.L. Jones (1961), who stated that "the immediate results of this instructional program in library science to the retarded were so satisfactory that it would seem to indicate that further study with these groups is needed... ."

Schwartz and Schofield (1965) described their experiences in using transparencies and study guides in teaching the use of encyclopedias to elementary school children.

Programmed instruction has also received some attention. Reed (1963) discussed programmed instruction in libraries, reviewing work by Waller, McCoy, Trump, and others. McCoy (1962) reported a study on instruction in library techniques to college freshmen. A sample of freshmen was selected and then divided into three groups of approximately seventy-five each: Group I (experimental) was instructed by machine; Group II (control) was taught the same subject matter by the lecture method; and Group III (zero) had no instruction. Testing a null hypothesis that "... there is no significant difference in student achievement in learning how to use the library between freshmen taught by the conventional method and freshmen taught by the teaching machine," McCoy found (1) no significant difference in the achievement scores between the experimental and control groups and (2) a lesser performance by the zero group than the other two. Genung (1965) reported the use of a teaching machine, the "Videosonic," which incorporated the visual, audio, and response types into one. Five machines were used, one located in the lobby and programmed for general information, and four in subject divisions, programmed for periodical indices and the use of the card catalog. Two classes in introductory sociology were given an orientation to the library and the videosonic machines were available to them; a third class in introductory sociology did not have the orientation program and students were asked not to use the machines. Genung found that students who had had the orientation and had used the videosonic machines used less professional library time to find information to complete their assignments.

One major study in student use of libraries and the integration of library instruction with the curriculum was the Monteith Project, reported by Knapp (1961, 1964), and dealt with in this paper in the area on accessibility and use.

A survey of the status of the teaching of library skills in Connecticut elementary and secondary schools was conducted by the Connecticut School Library Association and reported by Jay and Yesner (1964). Gathering data by questionnaire, and based on a 41.54 o/o return, the study treated the stated curricula of the schools (45.23 o/o of the schools had library skills in their written curricula; 54.32 o/o of the schools formally taught library skills), testing and grading of the skills taught (45.89 o/o reported no grading or testing), teching tools, responsibility for teaching library skills (cooperation between the school librarian and the teacher necessary), the accessibility of the library, and the library staff.

STATE AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS

This area is intended to treat state and federal aid programs, their effects on school libraries, and the influence of state departments of education, regional accrediting associations, and library and education associations on school library development.

Some information portraying state programs was found in reports of state departments of education and of the state school library supervisors. Much descriptive information has been provided in the literature concerning federal programs under the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Bomar (1966) commented on various federal acts such as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964, and others, and reviewed specifically the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, noting the increased attention to school libraries by the federal government. Gaver (1960) summarized the effects of the National Defense Education Act in various states.

Mahar's study on the responsibilities of state departments of education for school libraries (1960) reported on the services provided these libraries and on the responsibilities of the departments toward school libraries.

Based on replies received from the departments of education, the study was also concerned with the legal bases for the services and responsibilities, the personnel in state departments who dealt with school libraries, and the strengths and needs of the state departments.

LIBRARY RESEARCH METHODS AND STATISTICS

This area is intended to deal with statistics of school libraries, a national pattern for gathering such statistics, state requirements, and local compilations. It also is concerned with research methods utilized to study school library programs and aspects of such programs.

Statistics for school libraries may be found in abundance in the various status studies, but are normally confined to local school systems or to relatively restricted geographic areas. Information on national statistics may be found in publications of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and of the American Library Association.

Mahar and Holladay (1964) reported on the 1960-61 statistics for public school libraries, and Mahar interpreted and analysed these statistics. The Mahar and Holladay compilation and the Mahar interpretation were superseded by the Darling 1962-63 statistics of public school libraries (1964). Darling surveyed a stratified sample of secondary schools with enrollments of one hundred fifty or more pupils and with centralized libraries, and compared the status of school libraries in 1962-63 with a previous (1958-59) survey of school libraries by Mahar. Among the findings were: schools with centralized libraries increased from 50 o/o to 59 o/o; students served by centralized libraries increased from 68 o/o to 74 o/o; approximately 50 o/o of the elementary school libraries reported centralized libraries; approximately

56 o/o of all school librarians were in secondary schools, with 29 o/o in elementary schools and 16 o/o in combined schools; and 78.1 o/o of the school librarians had fifteen or more credits in library science. Data concerned with collections and expenditures revealed an average per pupil expenditure for books of $2.28 (an increase of $.68 per pupil over 1958-59), an average of 6.2 volumes per pupil (an increase of 0.9 books per pupil), and the inclusion of audio-visual materials in the libraries of 66 o/o of the schools.

Such statistical information as presented by Mahar and Darling was especially useful when compared to standards in the various topics covered, and were indicative of the status of school libraries and school librarians. Such a comparison was contained in the "National Inventory of Library Needs" in the section on school libraries. There school library needs or gaps were identified by comparing statistical data from reports of the Office of Education with the 1960 "Standards for School Library Programs."

Information on various methods of research may also be found in an examination of certain research studies, such as Gaver's development of instruments to ascertain the effectiveness of centralized elementary school libraries, the Knapp report of the library science-sociological study at Monteith, or Jones' research on socio-economic levels and school library services. Such studies are reported in this investigation in the various areas to which they obtain.

SERVICES TO TEACHERS AND STUDENTS, AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

This area pertains to all the various services normally available in school libraries and to special services provided for special programs or special groups, such as advanced placement plans and programs for the mentally retarded. Services to, and influences on, aspects of the school program, such as curriculum planning, reading instruction, and in-service education of teachers, are also covered here.

General Services

Research on general services of school libraries was available. Sheil (1965) surveyed Ohio's public secondary school library services in 1956 and 1963 and noted the major improvements in the libraries. The principal aspect of the 1956 survey was reported to have been the influence of the librarian on the services offered. The 1963 survey noted that one-third of the school principals believed the library inadequate.

M.L. Jones (1964) tested the hypothesis that public and school library service for twelfth grade students varied according to the socio-economic level of the neighborhood. Selecting two large city main public libraries and four branch libraries in each, four small public libraries, and eight high school libraries, in communities of varying socio-economic levels, Jones collected data on the communities, schools, libraries, and students, and compared the data on libraries and library services with the socio-economic levels established.

The hypothesis was generally substantiated, and especially in hours, personnel, and size and quality of collections in the branch libraries of one city, in the collections and quarters of the school libraries, and in the services offered by the larger staffs of the higher socio-economic neighborhood levels for both school and public libraries.

Secondary School Library Services

Certain studies pertained particularly to secondary school library services. Meyer (1957) surveyed the services in the North Central accredited schools of Nebraska, using as an evaluative instrument, " A Planning Guide For the High School Library Program" (modified). More recent state surveys of services were Sheil's (1965) of Ohio's public secondary schools in 1956 and 1963. She stated the 1963 respondents judged the availability of materials for home and class loan as the most outstanding library service, and reported reference service as adequate in 98.2 % of the schools. One of the recommendations of the Donnelly dissertation (1965) was the development of an in-service program to acquaint teachers with the services and personnel of instructional materials centers. The demands on school library services and collections of flexible scheduling was described by Manlove and Beggs (1965) and Tidwell and Wiseblood (1965), the latter noting a program in which 33%-40% of each student's time was planned for independent study.

Elementary School Library Services

Further research on elementary school library services was available. Autio (1958) reported the opinions of elementary school principals in selected Nebraska schools concerning the difficulty of providing sufficient library service without a full-time librarian. In a determination of library services in North Carolina elementary schools and an analysis of the services in comparison with state and national standards, covering program, personnel, organization, materials, expenditures, and quarters, Parker (1962) found that "... a good program of library instruction and reading guidance were found in few schools," and that "quantitative standards should be based upon a statement of the program of services to be rendered by the elementary school library."

The current status of reading instruction in elementary schools, and recommendations for the improvement of instruction, was the subject of "The First R" (Austin and Morrison, 1963). Among the findings were: (1) reading was taught to a "moderate" degree by the self-selection of reading materials (trade or library books) in 47 o/o of the schools surveyed (grades one through three) and 54 o/o in grades four through six; (2) programs to improve reading instruction were hampered in schools without centralized libraries or adequate facilities; (3) the lack of trained librarians, inadequacy of funds, and the increased number of pupils have adversely affected the services and quality of school library programs; (4) "Central libraries with full-time teacher-librarians [school librarians professionally trained in library science and education] ... were able to offer almost complete service for all students and teachers, limited only by the material and the number of children needing service"; (5) special programs for the retarded and gifted were affected by the library program. One of the concluding recommendations of "The First R" was the establishment of a centralized library with a full-time school librarian and with a book collection which met national standards and which was selected by a selection committee lead by the librarian.

A study of elementary school library services was undertaken by the Tacoma Association of Classroom Teachers (1962). One aspect of the research investigated the relationships between library services and the time spent in a school by a traveling librarian, concluding that "... a minimum of time to provide such service was more than two days a week in elementary schools of over 200 population."

Part of Durrell's research (1959) utilized a "balanced reading program" for enrichment of instruction in grades four, five and six, borrowing interest-grouped collections from the public library (there apparently being no school libraries in the system). This stimulation of reading by the schools might have been reflected in the reported doubling of the circulation of the children's department of the public library.

In evaluating the effect of the establishment of three demonstration libraries in Indiana elementary schools, Goodwin (1964) noted a relationship between the setting up of the demonstration libraries, with full-time librarians and adequate services and facilities, and the establishment of other libraries of equal caliber in other schools, thus confirming her original premise that a demonstration was "... the most effective means for producing change."

Special Services

Certain special programs or special services were also observed. Toronto's program of information retrieval for students (a search service which provided bibliographies, books and xeroxed articles for individual students) was described by Freiser (1963). Hastings and Tanner (1963) tested the influence of systematic library usage on high school students' language skills, and found a significant difference in language skills improvement between students who did and did not have systematic library work. A program of library services for seventh grade gifted and slow learners was depicted by Lenon (1962). She concluded that both groups needed and reacted to individual reading guidance and that the creativity of the gifted and the communication skills of the slow learners could be stimulated by using library materials. Casper (1964) reported on the effects of a Junior Great Books Program on gifted fifth grade pupils. Green's examination of schools in two rural counties of the South, and the effects of segregated schools on Negro pupils, noted the inadequacies of the school libraries and recommended programs of expanded services in the school libraries. Library services to the culturally disadvantaged were discussed by Lowrie (1965), and successful programs of library services throughout the United States were portrayed.

Services for Teachers

School library services for teachers have also been studied. A national report of the secondary school teacher and the services of the school library was issued by the National Education Association (1958). Based on a questionnaire return of 29.4 o/o, the report found (1) the majority of schools had programs for the development of students' library skills, (2) most teachers recognized "... library services as either essential or important to effective teaching in their subject areas," and (3) the library was providing materials aiding the professional growth of teachers. The study further found that teachers divided into three distinct groups in their use of library materials: (1) major users (English, social studies, and science); (2) minor users (business education, industrial arts, and mathematics); and (3) potential users (art, foreign languages, home economics, music, health, and physical education).

An interesting indication of the position of school librarians in relation to classroom teachers was the report of the California Senate Factfinding Committee on Governmental Administration (1963). School librarians were ranked second or third, following only school principals and fellow teachers, as to the "degree of helpfulness in enabling classroom teachers to do a better job of teaching."

Matthews (1963) described the services, facilities, location, personnel, and staff relationships inherent in the establishment of staff libraries in schools for the mentally retarded, and identified the continuing education of the professional staff as the most important reason or service of such a library.

Services to which teachers might have become accustomed during their educational preparation were reported in at least two studies (and, additionally, in the research on teacher education in and acquaintance with school libraries in the area on accessibility and use). MacVean (1958) surveyed curriculum laboratories in fifteen Midwestern institutions of teacher-training, and reported the services listed by ten or more of the institutional laboratories: "... (1) to assist students in construction of units of work and lesson plans; (2) to collect and organize curriculum materials; (3) to assist in selection and analysis of textbooks and other materials; (4) to advise students about curriculum problems; (5) to give lectures to students about curriculum materials; (6) to lend curriculum materials." Rogers (1961) described a program at Oberlin used to acquaint master's degree candidates in teaching with instructional materials in general, with those in special subject areas, and with sources for selecting and evaluating them.

HOUSING AND EQUIPMENT

This area is concerned with the location, arrangement, facilities and equipment of school libraries and with the role of the librarian in planning school libraries.

Some information on school library facilities and housing was found in various status studies. Much descriptive information on local schools and school systems was also available. Some research studies and some descriptive reports were found.

A dissertation on the use of library standards in planning school library facilities was reported by Herald (1957), who utilized the then existing American Library Association standards and then compared twenty-five selected, recently constructed school libraries with the standards. The analysis showed certain planning weaknesses: (1) greater flexibility needed; (2) more student seating; (3) more attention to spatial relationships; (4) more care with the details of the facilities; (5) provision for all types of instructional materials. Herald's conclusions pointed out the necessity for drawing up educational specifications as part of the initial planning, with the librarian serving as a leader of the planning team, and the effectiveness of library standards as a resource in planning.

Trotter (1964) examined physical facilities and basic space for instructional materials centers, using standards he established through searches of the literature and interviews with experts, and also devising a fortran computer program based on those standards. Trotter drew the following conclusions:

(1) there was a developing awareness of instructional materials centers' values; (2) the development of educational specifications was the most feasible procedure for planning such centers; (3) though no optimum design existed for instructional materials centers, "There are, however, certain basic kinds of space that are necessary..." and "... the planning of space for effective use of aural and visual techniques of instruction is vital to providing an optimum learning environment."

The myths of school libraries which presented pitfalls in planning were discussed by Helfrich (1965) and identified as (1) large study areas with large tables to ease supervisory problems, (2) separate librarians' offices, (3) perimeter shelving, (4) "silent" libraries, (5) heavy wooden furniture specifically designed for libraries, (6) location in a central room in the main classroom building, (7) peripheral status given to non-book materials, (8) special checkout system for teachers as opposed to locating teachers' offices in or near the library, (9) library orientation classes scheduled only on teacher demand, and (10) library inaccessibility when access was limited to scheduled visits.

Sharp (1965) outlined the steps to be taken by educators and architects in planning school library facilities, exemplified by planning for an instructional materials center. Here Sharp pointed out the necessity for defining not only the philosophy, need and purpose of the proposed facility, but also the activities and functions, and the space needed to implement them. Elements in school library planning (general location, necessary rooms, use of color, reading rooms, and furniture and equipment) were discussed by Taylor (1964).

A major series of articles, edited by Johnson and Bomar (1964) appraised planning quarters for school libraries, and contained discussions of the functions and activities of a school library and their effects on quarters and equipment, the role of the architect, educational specifications, and case studies and floor plans of elementary and secondary school libraries. The libraries were selected as examples of plans reflecting flexibility, activity areas, space and functional relationships, "predetermined purposes and activites to be housed," and various provisions in equipment and furniture.

In "Library Facilities for Elementary and Secondary Schools" (Office of Education, 1965), after a discussion of the influence of educational trends on school libraries and of innovations in school library facilities, quarters, and programs, guidelines for facilities, based on the 1960 "Standards for School Library Programs" and various state standards, were given. Among the aspects of libraries treated were general location, size, shape, rooms and/or areas, furniture and equipment, and certain physical features such as lighting, sound control, general appearance, and spatial relationships. In each instance, specific recommendations were made.

Ellsworth and Wagener (1963) in their report for the Educational Facilities Laboratory described school library plans and included "prototype architectural designs" and drawings and examples of library facilities and equipment. This report, as in the other reports of the Educational Facilities Laboratory, emphasized the instructional materials concept and the use of new educational media in school library planning.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER LIBRARIES

This area examines the relationships of school libraries to the other types of libraries, and particularly the functions, cooperative efforts, services, clientele, and roles of school and public libraries.

Various state surveys and studies were reported. Phillips and Lauris (1962) in their study of the public libraries of Oregon included a description of the inter-action between public libraries and school libraries and of the services provided school libraries by three county libraries. Schenk's survey of the Arkansas public libraries (1964) noted the services furnished by public libraries to school libraries and recommended the discontinuance of the state library commission's practice of sending book collections to schools. Humphrey (1963) described the status of school and public libraries in Rhode Island (where 58.97 o/o of the towns lacked certified librarians in the public schools) and emphasized the inter-relationships of school and public libraries in providing quality service.. Reporting on a questionnaire survey of Wisconsin public libraries, with an 88 o/o return, Burr (1963) noted 53 o/o of the public libraries as meeting with school personnel and 51 o/o visiting schools, but only 8.58 o/o of the public library boards as adopting policies related to student use or public library-public school relationships. Interestingly, the public librarians rated their working relationships with schools as good (47.7 o/o) or excellent (23.1 o/o). Among the recommendations by school principals for improving public school-public library communications, as reported by Sheil (1965), were (1) "positive working relationship with the public library" and (2) "teacher-public librarian cooperation." Leigh and Crawford (1960) reviewed school and public libraries in Hawaii, and Wezeman (1965), in Pennsylvania.

Interdependence of libraries in various regions or communities has also been examined. McIntyre (1965) described the cooperative extension of services by school and public libraries in Dade County, Florida. Westchester County, New York, Library System inaugurated a program improving library services to high school students. Winkler's comments (1966) on this program noted conclusions after one year's operation: more school-public library cooperation was needed; and separate collections of books in public and school libraries were required.

Fenwick (1960), in her discussion of public library and school relationships, examined the library resources available to high school students in twenty-seven Chicago suburban communities. She identified certain common problems: (1) lack of provision of print materials other than books; (2) larger and more established communities had fewer pressures on public libraries by student use; (3) communication between schools and public libraries existed in the larger, well-established communities but was lacking in communities with less well developed public libraries; (4) "the lengthening of the school hours of service... is an important development"; (5) school librarians needed to refer serious students to university, special or state collections; (6) the problem of duplication of materials was not a concern; and (7) cooperation in selection of materials needed to be investigated. Fenwick concluded that "there is today ... a discouragingly vast separation in understanding and a great absence of communication" between public librarians and school personnel.

Petty and Reid (1963) conducted an interview survey of 206 students in four representative Chicago suburban public libraries to determine why the students used the public library, whether they had used the school library, and elements influencing students to select public or school libraries. 48.6 o/o of the students were using the public library for reference purposes (6.4 o/o for socializing). Approximately one-third of the students had used the school library prior to their public library visit, with their reasons for public library use being stated as "need for more material" (52 o/o), lack of time in which to use the school library (21 o/o), and "material not available at school" (26 o/o). 59.6 o/o did not use the school library first, lack of time to use it being the principal reason. When asked which library they would prefer if the school library were open the same hours as the public library, 73.3 o/o of the students preferred the public library mainly because of the better book and periodical collections and the convenient location of the public library.

Among the conclusions of Ducat's dissertation (1960), which were based on data from questionnaires answered by 2,266 students and 108 teachers in three Mid-West parochial schools (secondary), from records of library use, and from other supplementary data, were: (1) only a small percentage of students made frequent and regular visits to the school library; (2) better students, proportionately, used the school library more than students of lesser ability, but the latter depended almost entirely on the school library; (3) better students used a "wider variety of library sources" and a "wider variety of library materials"; and (4) "Most of the students use the public library as a complement to the school library, but about one-fifth use it as a substitute for the school library."

One examination by Freeman and Company, management consultants, of public libraries in three California counties (1965) concluded, concerning school libraries, that they did not and could not serve students effectively and that "the need for library collections within school facilities is not established." These conclusions were apparently based on student interviews in the public library and on an indeterminate number of visits to certain school libraries. No criteria for the selection of the school libraries were given. No exhaustive study of school libraries, their services, standards, or level of programs and performance was apparently undertaken to support conclusions on school libraries.

Other studies,of, perhaps, wider scope were also reported. Martin's report (1963) of reading and the sources of reading materials of students (the relatively good readers) in Baltimore appeared to apply, in some respects, to other localities also. Data was gathered from interviews with heads of households of a selected sample of 1,913 households in the Baltimore-area, from questionnaires from 3,578 students in twenty-three public and parochial schools (excluding the non-readers, approximately 33 o/o of the students), and from questionnaires from Central Pratt Library and branch libraries users. Among the findings were: (1) the average student was in the school or public library eight to nine hours a week, with these libraries supplying over eight million hours of service a year; (2) school or public libraries furnished four out of five of all non-textbooks read by students; (3) "School libraries supply approximately one-third of the library needs of their students"; (4) most students preferred to use the public library because of better collections, the hours of service, and fewer restrictions; (5) over one-half of the public library patrons were students with school-related reading; (6) increased school enrollments and increased demands on the public library will probably result in the public library devoting at least 75 o/o of its services to students; (7) "The school libraries with their present resources will be unable to absorb much of the increase. ... The school libraries will play only a token role in the educational programs of schools, unless very substantial changes are made." After reviewing the findings of his study, Martin then proposed a program of action, the principal focus of which was the immediate improvement of Baltimore's school libraries. This was an extensive and important study of library services to students and of the demands of, and the use by, students on all types of libraries, with implications for future development in school and public libraries.

Another report on student use (American Library Association, 1964) presented information on the availability and accessibility of materials for students in twenty-four selected school systems (reported more fully here in the area on accessibility and use). Both the study by Gross (1963) and that of Conant (1965) were also concerned with aspects of school library and public library cooperation.

A different aspect of school library-public library relationships, that of the main or branch public library housed in a school, was surveyed by White (1963). Primarily directed at the effects of a school location on service to adults, this survey presented the following information: (1) public librarians were generally opposed to school-housed public libraries; (2) services of branch libraries in schools were less than those independently housed; and (3) collections in school-housed public libraries were not sufficient to serve adults effectively. Comments for and against the school-housed public library and descriptions of cases of school-housed public libraries were also included.

SELECTION AND CENSORSHIP

This area is concerned with the problems, practices, and proficiencies of school personnel and pupils in the selection of materials for the library. The role and effectiveness of book selection committees and selection policies are also included. Additionally, internal and external censorship of library materials is treated.

A great variety of periodical descriptions on materials selection were available, many portraying the problems and solutions of individuals or particular libraries. Some studies, also, were reported. Hodges (1957), in her survey of sixty-one state and local school library supervisors to ascertain book selection practices, noted that over half the respondents reported no guiding book selection policy in their systems and that there was general agreement on three elements of selection: (1) the freedom of each school to select; (2) wide participation in selection was fundamental; and (3) the assistance of the supervisor in selection was needed. Hodges further identified problems in book selection as the librarians' failure to read, problems of locating curriculum-related books, knowledge of the total school program, and the importance of building balanced collections. Rowell (1966) discussed the importance of book selection/examination centers, describing several in operation.

Information on the selection of books in elementary schools without libraries was presented by McCusker (1963), who surveyed, in 1956-1957, the elementary and rural schools in Iowa by questionnaire, visit, and case study. Rural schools which depended on county superintendent's collections had most of their available materials selected by the county superintendent. In elementary schools teachers and district superintendents were the selectors. McCusker found, " The majority of the superintendents and teacher did not indicate familiarity with professional book selection tools and did not use them," with the superintendents relying on "... book clubs, book company salesmen, and the Iowa Education Association..." and the teachers, on "... the Association, book clubs, 'Grade Teacher' and 'Instructor'."

Reviewing media as aids in book selection were studied by Galloway (1965) whose purpose was to examine the extent to which juvenile books published during a fifteen month period in eight periodicals or newspapers were reviewed, and to judge the effectiveness of such reviews. Galloway noted that 25% of the books were not reviewed in any of the media, that only two periodicals reviewed more than 50% of the books, that "... more descriptive and critical reviews of juvenile books are needed," that reviewers need " ... to be more aware of the increasingly vast and diverse audience which relies on reviews in selecting books for schools," and that "periodic assessment of reviews of juvenile books is needed." A most interesting portion of the Galloway dissertation was her list of criteria by which the reviews were assessed. Cianciolo (1963) established certain criteria for the use of books in elementary schools, some of which (demographic factors, reading interests, curricular areas, and procedures and responsibilities) concerned the selection of trade books for the schools.

Two background studies, among others, provided information and understanding on literature studied in American high schools (Anderson, 1964) and on the "...psychological principles universally seen in the adolescent period" through quotations and critical interpretations of fictional material (Kiell, 1959).

A further aspect of this area is censorship, in which research has been accomplished. Some background studies were available.

Jahoda's research (1964), based on literature searches and interviews with experts, was intended to examine "... whether so-called 'obscene' reading matter has a detrimental effect on young people in the sense of inducing socially or individually harmful habits and actions," and to identify important relevant experiential factors. Among the conclusions of this study was the appraisal that there was no evidence in the literature on juvenile delinquency that "... would justify the assumption that reading has a major motivating force in it"(juvenile delinquency).

Berninghausen's and Faunce's study (1964) explored the relationships between juvenile delinquency and the reading of "sensational books," finding that "... more delinquent boys appeared prone to read adult books, with erotic content, than were non-delinquent boys," these books generally being similar to adult reading tastes and not "sensational.""No inference of causal relationship between delinquency and reading sensational books is made," concluded the investigators.

A major study in this field was the Fiske (1959) analysis of censorship in California school and public libraries. Fiske examined censorship in selection, in restrictions on circulation and location, and also reported on administrator-librarian relationships and the isolation of the school librarian. Fiske noted that most school librarians "... habitually avoid controversial material, and there is not one who does not take controversiality into account under some circumstances." Fiske further found that internal censorship (questions raised on materials by school personnel) was more prevalent than external censorship (questions raised by parents or other non-school personnel), but that external censorship was resisted more than internal censorship was.

Ahrens (1965) surveyed a selected sample of secondary school teachers who were members of the National

Council of Teachers of English in order to determine censorship attempts on the teachers in textbook or recommended library reading (80.05% return). 12.6% of the teachers reported at least one specific objection, in a two-year period, of a book used or proposed to be used in an English course. Ahrens reported the major incidence of censorship in fairly large suburban schools, with teachers who were "doing a good job of teaching English," who had majored in English and had advanced work, and who attempted teaching realistic modern American fiction. Another survey of English teachers and administrators (not librarians) in Wisconsin schools was reported by Burress (1963). Bach (1965) and Lutnick (1962) generally reviewed censorship in schools and defenses against it.

An investigation of censorship in Nassau County (New York) senior high libraries (Farley, 1964) disclosed: (1) most of the librarians had experienced censorship attempts, generally ineffective, by non-school personnel; (2) all librarians exercised censorship, with about 30% rarely censoring and less than 10% usually censoring; (3) books frankly depicting sex were censored by all librarians; and (4) censorship performed because of the opinions of the librarians was more prevalent than that suggested by non-staff members.

Conclusions

This study has demonstrated, in some measure, the varied interests of certain groups of school librarians in the research needs in their field. With certain exceptions, there would appear to have been substantial concern on the part of the librarians for the initiation of research in certain areas previously not examined, for an extension of certain exploratory studies, and for the replication or updating of older research. The exceptions were principally directed at historical studies, which might well compel the conclusion that the respondents were chiefly interested in "action research" on certain critical, current issues. It should also be noted that little interest in highly technical processes (except automation and centralization) and in certain more narrow aspects of school librarianship was shown.

If we continue to follow the general plan of the instrument employed here and the organization utilized in reporting existing research, then it is possible to indicate, in admittedly rough measures, the concerns expressed here. Examining first the grand means of the various areas, it might be observed that the area of most importance was Area K, library instruction, followed by Area N, services, while the area of least importance was Area E, collections, preceded by Area H, technical processes:

Rank Order of the Areas (Determined by Grand Means)

Area	Grand Mean	Rank Order
A, Aims	3.68	8
B, Standards	3.67	9
C, Administration	3.62	11
D, Personnel	3.66	10
E, Collections	3.44	15
F, Budgets	3.78	6
G, Access and use	3.90	5
H, Technical processes	3.46	14
I, Publicity	3.91	4
J, Guidance	3.52	13
K, Instruction	4.12	1
L, State & federal programs	3.92	3
M, Research	3.66	10
N, Services	3.93	2
O, Housing	3.54	12
P, Relations, other libraries	3.52	13
Q, Selection-censorship	3.72	7

It should be noted, however, that the above can be considered as no more than a rough, general indication of the possible concerns of the respondents, as the items and means within the areas were combined to produce the table, obviously obscuring some information.

If, on the other hand, we examine the individual items, a further measure of concern might be indicated in the percentage of total response on the scale in the category, "absolutely essential." All items of the questionnaire, where one third (33.00% was used as the out-off figure) of all the respondents ranked the item as "absolutely essential," are noted below, in rank order, divided into (1) items ranked "absolutely essential" by 50% or more of the respondents, (2) by 40% to 49.99% of the respondents, and (3) by 33% to 39.99% of the respondents.

Items Rated "Absolutely Essential" by 50% or More of the Respondents (in Rank Order)

Rank	Item	No. on Questionnaire	%
1.	Contributions of the school library to the learning process (especially effects on academic achievement)	A-1	73.37
2.	Contributions of the school library to the teaching process	A-2	68.64
3.	The school library in teacher education (teacher-training institutions)	N-12	57.99
4.	School libraries as instructional materials centers	A-5	53.85
5.	Centralized services at local, county, and regional levels	H-1	53.25
6.	Methods of evaluating the school library collections	E-8	52.66
7.	Teachers' attitudes toward school libraries	I-2	52.44
8.	Tools for evaluating school libraries (type, effectiveness, etc.)	B-7	52.07
8.	Administrators' attitudes toward school libraries	I-1	52.07
9.	Study of the optimum number of personnel (professional, technical, clerical) required to give adequate service	D-11	50.30
10.	Effect of centralized libraries in all levels of schools on teacher/pupil use	G-10	50.30

Items Rated "Absolutely Essential" by 40 - 49.99 Per Cent of the Respondents (in rank order)

Rank	Item	No. on Questionnaire	Per Cent
11.	Teacher use of school libraries (especially relationships between recency of educational preparation and use, subjects taught and use, etc.)	G-7	49.70
12.	Problems and patterns of organization and administration of separate and combined school libraries and audio-visual departments.	C-7	49.11
12.	Efficacy of various programs of library instruction for pupils (formal instruction, instruction integrated with teaching units, library orientation, etc.).	K-1	49.11
13.	Effectiveness of selection tools for non-print materials (especially in different subject raeas).	E-6	48.52
14.	Educational preparation of school librarians (and recency of training).	D-2	47.93
15.	Evaluating student use of the school library.	G-2	44.97
15.	Study of the effective use, housing, and equipment of audio-stations, listening booths, listening rooms, electronic carrels, and study carrels.	O-7	44.97
16.	Students' attitudes toward school libraries.	I-6	44.38
17.	Use of school libraries in independent study programs and traditionally organized programs.	G-5	43.79
18.	Selection principles for non-print materials(especially in different subject areas).	E-4	42.60
18.	Adequacy of school library budgets.	F-1	42.60
18.	Methods, problems, and costs of organizing, cataloging, storing, and circulating audio-visual materials (including repair).	H-9	42.60

Items Rated "Absolutely Essential" by 40-49.99 Per Cent of the Respondents (in rank order) (cont.)

Rank	Item	No. on Questionnaire	Per Cent
19.	Effects of federal aids on local school libraries. L-5		42.01
19.	Relationship of the school library budget to the total instructional budget. F-6		42.01
20.	Integrated use of reference materials in the instructional program of the school. K-3		40.83

Items Rated "Absolutely Essential" by 33-39.99 Per Cent of the Respondents (in rank order)

Rank	Item	No. on Questionnaire	Per Cent
21.	Role of the library in team teaching.	N-1	39.05
22.	Comparison of availability of materials, services, costs, personnel, etc. between centralized school libraries and departmental resource centers.	C-8	38.46
22.	Library orientation practices for teachers (especially new teachers).	N-4	38.46
23.	Role of state departments of education in school library improvement.	L-1	37.87
23.	Librarian's role in planning new libraries or remodeling old libraries.	O-9	37.87
24.	Evaluating circulation methods.	H-8	36.69
24.	Influence of the school librarian on local curriculum development.	N-9	36.69
25.	Development of a national pattern for the gathering of uniform library statistics at the state and local levels.	M-1	35.50
25.	Teacher's role in selection (and educational preparation of teachers in selection).	Q-1	35.50
26.	Programs of extended use of school library facilities (evening, weekend, summer).	G-1	34.91
26.	Relationships of school and public library service (distinctive functions and areas of cooperation).	P-1	34.91
26.	Use and effectiveness of book selection policies.	Q-8	34.91
27.	Educational preparation of school library supervisors.	D-19	34.32
27.	Articulation of library instruction at all levels.	K-2	34.32
27.	Effectiveness of various teaching techniques and devices (library science).	K-4	34.32

Items Rated "Absolutely Essential" by 33-39.99 Per Cent of the Respondents (in rank order) (cont.)

Rank	Item	No. on Questionnaire	Per Cent
27.	Functions of the library in programs of reading instruction.	N-10	34.32
28.	Present status of school libraries as compared with the 1960 "Standards for School Library Programs."	B-4	33.14
28.	Survey of school library aid programs on the state and federal levels.	L-6	33.14

In scrutinizing the items above ranked one through ten, the overwhelming response in rank order one and two should be noted. Though these rankings were undoubtedly a measure of the concern of the respondents for the contributions of the school library to the teaching/learning processes, they might also be indicative of "socially desirably" responses.

As demonstrated by the responses and rank orderings, the respondents appeared to express their opinion as to the major importance of: the contributions of the school library to the teaching/learning processes; centralizing libraries and technical processes; evaluations of libraries and library personnel; attitudes toward school libraries on the part of the school staff (and their competence and acquaintance with school libraries; and the instructional materials center concept.

When the second part , the so-called "open-end" questionnaire, is examined, then the stated concerns of the respondents were centered in the areas of school librarians' educational preparation and of the acute shortage of school librarians. These might have been reflective, to some extent, of the proportionately larger representation of the state school library supervisors in response to this portion of the questionnaire. The supervisors seemed to be particularly concerned with the shortage of personnel.

In comparing the major concerns of the library leaders,as expressed by their responses to the scaled questionnaire and the open-end questionnaire, with the recent research reviewed above, it should be stated that, in general, no definitive research study existed in any of the areas. Some surveys and status studies were found, most of which reported the then current position of school libraries and school librarians in a limited geographic area. Many Many descriptions of practices and problems exist. Of considerable importance were the implications of the reports of various demonstration projects such as the Knapp Project and the Shaker Heights Project. Various historical essays also proved of interest. However, experiemtal, controlled research in the various problem areas of school librarianship, or, indeed, in the raison d'etre for school libraries, or in their contributions to the objectives of education was, in the view of this investigator, almost non-existent.

Thus, this investigation has identified various items and areas of research, and has provided an indication of the relative importance assigned to the items and areas by a national group of school librarians selected on the basis of their leadership positions. The project has further attempted to describe existing research, and to compare, where possible, the existing research with the identified research needs.

The extent and variety of the respondents' interests should be noted, as should the response rate of the profession to this lengthy, detailed questionnaire. It would appear that the concerns expressed here and the rates of response would indicate, to some measure, that the leaders in school librarianship have an interest in research into the problems of their field. If the interest of the leaders were indicative of the interest of the whole profession, and it would appear as though it might be so, then it might be stated that school librarians in general seem to be concerned with research in school librarianship.

Thus, an expressed and implied interest in research appears to have been shown. A corollary to this interest seems to be both the preparation of school librarians in research and the opportunities available for school librarians to do studies. It, therefore, seems logical to advocate an increased attention to research, research needs, and research techniques in the educational preparation of school librarians. And, further, it appears logical to advocate that greater opportunities be afforded school librarians to initiate, participate in, and have funded projects investigating problems in school librarianship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aceto, V.J., "Panacea or Pandora's Box? A Look at Central Processing in New York," LIBRARY JOURNAL 89:322-24, January 15, 1964.

Adams, H., "Changing Role of the Elementary School Library," READING TEACHER 18:563-66, April, 1965.

Ahlers, E.E., "Story of a Survey," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 13:19-29, May, 1964.

Ahrens, N.H., CENSORSHIP AND THE TEACHERS OF ENGLISH: A QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF A SELECTED SAMPLE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS OF ENGLISH. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1965.

Aldrich, F.D., THE SCHOOL LIBRARY IN OHIO WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON ITS LEGISLATIVE HISTORY. Scarecrow Press, 1959.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION.(AACTE Study Series No. 6) The Association, 1962.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES AND TEACHER EDUCATION: A SURVEY OF PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, AND PROBLEMS, 1963. (AACTE Study Series No. 7) The Association, 1963.

American Association of School Librarians, RESEARCH NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM. The Association, 1961.

American Association of School Librarians, STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS. American Library Association, 1960.

American Library Association, NATIONAL INVENTORY OF LIBRARY NEEDS. The Association, 1965.

American Library Association, STUDENT USE OF LIBRARIES: AN INQUIRY INTO THE NEEDS OF STUDENTS, LIBRARIES, AND THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS. The Association, 1964.

Anderson, S.B., BETWEEN THE GRIMMS AND "THE GROUP": LITERATURE IN AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOLS. Educational Testing Service, 1964.

Auld, L.W.S., "Compiling School Library Orders with Punched Cards in Centralizing Processing," HAWAII LIBRARY ASSOCIATION JOURNAL 20:14-25, Spring, 1964.

Austin, M.C. et al., THE FIRST R: THE HARVARD REPORT ON READING IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. Macmillan, 1963.

Autio, A.W., A STUDY OF LIBRARY PRACTICES AND FACILITIES IN SELECTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF NEBRASKA. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1958.

Bach, H., "Censorship of Library Books and Textbooks in American Schools, 1953-1963," JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION 40:3-15, January, 1965.

Barrileaux, L.E., "A Comparison of Textbooks and Multiple Library References - A Report on the Initial Phases of an Experimental Study," SCHOOL SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS 63:245-49, March, 1963.

Becker, E.A., AN APPRAISAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES FOR THE ACQUISITION AND DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS IN THE REGIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTERS OF PENNSYLVANIA. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Lehigh University, 1965.

Berninghausen, D.K. and Faunce, R.W., "An Exploratory Study of Juvenile Delinquency and the Reading of Sensational Books," JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATION 33:161-68, Winter, 1964.

Billings, J.K., "School Library Standards - - in Revision," WISCONSIN LIBRARY BULLETIN 62:80-83, March, 1966.

Bishop, M.D., IDENTIFICATION OF VALUABLE LEARNING EXPERIENCES IN CENTRALIZED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963.

Bomar, C.P., "Legislation and the School Library," BULLETIN OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS 50:89-95, January, 1966.

Bonn, G.S., TRAINING LAYMEN IN THE USE OF THE LIBRARY. Rutgers, Graduate School of Library Service, 1960.

Bothwell, B.K., CREATIVE EXPENDITURES FOR QUALITY EDUCATION. New York, N.Y.: Associated Public School Systems.

Breiland, M., RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE, LIBRARIES IN NEW MEXICO PUBLIC SCHOOLS. Carlsbad, N. Mex.: Hillcrest Elementary School.

Bruell, E., "Paperback Comes to Bremen High," ENGLISH JOURNAL 51:33-38, January, 1962.

Burns, H.S., "Found: A Predetermined Buying Formula that Works," NATION'S SCHOOLS 70:56-58, July, 1962.

Burr, E., "Study on Public Library-School Relationships Questionnaire," WISCONSIN LIBRARY BULLETIN 59:120-25, March, 1963.

Burress, L.A., HOW CENSORSHIP AFFECTS THE SCHOOL. (Special Bulletin No. 8) Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Bushnell, D.D., ed., THE AUTOMATION OF SCHOOL INFORMATION SYSTEMS. (Monograph No. 1) National Education Association, Department of Audiovisual Instruction, 1964.

California. Senate. Factfinding Committee on Governmental Administration, PRELIMINARY REPORT ON AN ANALYSIS OF THE HELPFULNESS OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE SCHOOL PROGRAM TO CLASSROOM TEACHING. The Senate, 1963.

Casper, T.P., EFFECTS OF THE GREAT BOOKS PROGRAM AT THE FIFTH GRADE LEVEL ON FOUR INTELLECTUAL OPERATIONS AND CERTAIN OF THEIR COMPONENT FACTORS AS DEFINED BY J.P. GUILFORD. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, 1964.

"Catholic H.S. Library Survey," NEWSLETTER (CLA High School Libraries Section) 9:2-6, Winter, 1964.

Christine, E.R., "School Library Extension: Real or Imagined?," ALA BULLETIN 60:623-26, June, 1966.

Cianciolo, P.J., CRITERIA FOR THE USE OF TRADE BOOKS IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROGRAM. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1963.

Coburn, L., A PLAN FOR CENTRALIZED CATALOGING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES OF NEW YORK CITY. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1961.

Cole, T.J., "Origin and Development of School Libraries," PEABODY JOURNAL OF EDUCATION 37:87-92, September, 1959.

Conant, R.W., ed., THE PUBLIC LIBRARY AND THE CITY. The M.I.T. Press, 1965.

Condit, M. and Sharp, G., "In-service: The Teacher meets the Library," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 13:35-37, May, 1964.

Cooper, C., "Experiment with Paperbound Books," LIBRARY JOURNAL 83:1245-48, April 15, 1958.

Corbacho, H.F., AN ANALYSIS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF SELECTED SYSTEM INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTER PROGRAMS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1963.

Cutts, W.G., RESEARCH IN READING FOR THE MIDDLE GRADES. (Bulletin 1963, no. 31) U.S. Office of Education, 1963.

Dane, C., "Role of Reading Guidance in the Total Guidance Program of the Elementary School," READING TEACHER 15:102-09, November, 1961.

Danton, J.P., "Doctoral Study in Librarianship in the United States," COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES 20:436-53, November, 1959.

Darling, R.L., PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARY STATISTICS, 1962-63. U.S. Office of Education, 1964.

Darling, R.L., SURVEY OF SCHOOL LIBRARY STANDARDS. (Circular No. 740) U.S. Office of Education, 1964.

Davenport, V.A., SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES OF A SELECTED GROUP OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS THEY RELATE TO SCHOOL LIBRARIES. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Atlanta University, 1962.

Day, N.J. and Jones, S., ACHIEVING QUALITY IN SCHOOL LIBRARY SERVICE: A REPORT OF A COMMITTEE OF THE SOUTHERN STATES WORK CONFERENCE, 1961. Tallahassee, Florida: Southern States Work Conference, 1961 (Available from the State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida).

Donnelly, E.J., THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTERS IN SELECTED HIGH SCHOOLS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1965.

Dorin, A., CURRENT PRACTICES IN VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES IN NEW YORK CITY. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1960.

Downs, R.B., ed., GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON LIBRARY RESOURCES OF NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES. The Commission, 1965.

Ducat, M.P.C., STUDENT AND FACULTY USE OF THE LIBRARY IN THREE SECONDARY SCHOOLS. Unpublished D.L.S. dissertation, Columbia University, 1960.

Durrell, D.D., ed., "Adapting Instruction to the Learning Needs of Children in Intermediate Grades," JOURNAL OF EDUCATION 142: 2-78, December, 1959.

Egoff, S. and Gibson, B.A., SCHOOL LIBRARY SERVICE IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF NEW WESTMINSTER; A STUDY OF BOOK COLLECTIONS AND SCHOOL LIBRARY SERVICE. University of British Columbia, School of Librarianship, 1963.

El-Hagrasy, S.M., THE TEACHER'S ROLE IN LIBRARY SERVICES; AN INVESTIGATION AND ITS DEVICES. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1961.

Ellsworth, R.E. and Wagener, H.D., THE SCHOOL LIBRARY: FACILITIES FOR INDENPENDENT STUDY. Educational Facilities Laboratory, 1963.

Emery, D.G., A CURRICULUM GUIDE FOR WORK-STUDY SKILLS, GRADES IV,V,VI. Rev. ed. Shaker Heights, Ohio: Shaker Heights City School District, 1964.

Emery, D.G., SECOND YEAR REPORT OF AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM IN WORK-STUDY SKILLS AND INDEPENDENT STUDY. Shaker Heights, Ohio: Shaker Heights City School District, 1963-64.

Emery, D.G., SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES TO FOLLOW UP WORK-STUDY SKILLS LESSONS. Rev. ed. Shaker Heights, Ohio: Shaker Heights City School District, 1964.

Emery, D.G., THIRD YEAR REPORT AND FINAL SUMMARY OF AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM IN WORK-STUDY SKILLS AND INDEPENDENT STUDY. GRADES IV,V,VI. LOMOND AND LUDLOW SCHOOLS. Shaker Heights, Ohio: Shaker Heights City School District, 1964-65.

Erbes, R.G.,"Microfilm in the High School Library," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 33:302-03, December, 1958.

"Evaluation of Elementary School Library Programs," SOUTHEASTERN LIBRARIAN 14:13-14, Spring, 1964.

Farley, J.J., BOOK CENSORSHIP IN THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES OF NASSAU COUNTY, NEW YORK. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1964.

Fatka, V., "Cost of Cataloging versus Printed Cards in the School Library," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 33:239, November, 1958.

Fenwick, S.I., "School and Public Library Relationships," LIBRARY QUARTERLY 30:63-74, January, 1960.

Figueroa, C., A SURVEY OF THE USE OF HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES BY TEACHERS IN A SELECTED NUMBER OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS OF THE LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Immaculate Heart College, 1960.

Finn, J.D. et al., STUDIES IN THE GROWTH OF INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY, I: AUDIO-VISUAL INSTRUMENTATION FOR INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1930-1960, A BASIS FOR TAKE-OFF. (Occasional Papers No. 6) National Education Association, Technological Development Project.

Fiske, M., BOOK SELECTION AND CENSORSHIP. University of California Press, 1959.

Fix, D.D., "Predated 'Date Due' Cards," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 14:51-52, October, 1964.

Foster, E.M., "Library Services in the Public Schools," SCHOOL LIFE 43:25, February, 1961.

Franko, A.M., "Why Mount Vernon put a Library in each Classroom," NATION'S SCHOOLS 77:89-90, March, 1966.

Freeman and Co., LIBRARY SYSTEMS STUDY FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF SANTA CLARA, ALAMEDA, AND CONTRA COSTA COUNTIES. Palo Alto, California: Freeman and Co., 1965.

Freiser, L.H., "Dr. Shaw and Toronto's Children," LIBRARY JOURNAL 86:1947-49, May 15, 1961.

Freiser, L.H., "Information Retrieval for Students, Revolutionary Library Program from Canada," LIBRARY JOURNAL 88:1121-23, MArch 15, 1963.

Freiser, L.H., "Students and Librarians: the Toronto Program," PHI DELTA KAPPAN 44:444, June, 1963.

Galloway, M.L., AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF THE REVIEWING OF JUVENILE BOOKS IN EIGHT JOURNALS AND NEWSPAPERS WITH SPECIAL REGARD TO THEIR HELPFULNESS AS SELECTION AIDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1965.

Gates, E.S., THE LIBRARY-SCHOOL COUNCIL OF WETHERSFIELD, CONNECTICUT. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Southern Connecticut State College, 1964.

Gaver, M.V., "Education of the Librarian for the Modern School," SCHOOL LIFE 44:32-37, July, 1962.

Gaver, M.V., EFFECTIVENESS OF CENTRALIZED LIBRARY SERVICE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (PHASE I). Rutgers, Graduate School of Library Service, 1960.

Gaver, M.V., "Effectiveness of Centralized Library Services in Elementary Schools (Phase I)," LIBRARY QUARTERLY 31:245-56, July, 1961.

Gaver, M.V., PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES TODAY. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1963.

Gaver, M.V., PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES TODAY. 2nd ed. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1965.

Gaver, M.V., "Research on Elementary School Libraries," ALA BULLETIN 56:117-24, February, 1962.

Gaver, M.V., "Research on the Effectiveness of Elementary School Libraries," LIBRARY TRENDS 13:103-16, July, 1964.

Gaver, M.V., "Teacher Education and School Libraries," ALA BULLETIN 60:63-72, January, 1966.

Gaver, M.V., "What NDEA Has Done for School Libraries," LIBRARY JOURNAL 85:317-20, January 15, 1960.

Gaver, M.V. and Velazquez, G., "SCHOOL LIBRARIES OF PUERTO RICO, A SURVEY AND PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT. (Available from M.V. Gaver, Rutgers University).

Gengler, C.R., A STUDY OF SELECTED PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS COMPARING TEACHER INSTRUCTED STUDENTS WITH LIBRARIAN-TEACHER INSTRUCTED STUDENTS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1965.

Genung, H., REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING-MACHINE PROGRAMS FOR INSTRUCTION IN THE USE OF THE LIBRARY. Walnut, California: Mt. San Antonio College.

Goodman, S.M., THE ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOL QUALITY. Albany, New York: State Education Department.

Goodwin, G.J., "Experimental Demonstration Centers," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 13:31-33, May, 1964.

Goodwin, G.J. and Richardson, E.G., STATUS OF SCHOOL LIBRARIES IN INDIANA, 1962-63. Indianapolis, Indiana: State Department of Public Instruction, (1964?).

Green, D.R. et al., BLACK BELT SCHOOLS: BEYOND DESEGREGATION. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Council.

Griffith, A.B., "Library Handbook Standards: Students and Faculty; Report of Survey," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 39:475-77, February, 1965.

Grogan, A.C., "Paperback Books Invade the School Library," CHICAGO SCHOOLS 43:219-23, February, 1962.

Gross, E.H., CHILDREN'S SERVICES IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES. American Library Association, 1963.

Hajda, J., AN AMERICAN PARADOX: PEOPLE AND BOOKS IN A METROPOLIS. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.

Hall, M.E., "The Development of the Modern High School Library," LIBRARY JOURNAL 40:627-32, September, 1915.

Hall, S.D., A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TWO TYPES OF ORGANIZATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTERS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1963.

Hartz, F.R., "High School Library: A Study in Use, Misuse and Non-use," THE CLEARING HOUSE 38:423-28, March, 1964.

Hartz, F.R. and Samuelson, R.T., "Origin, Development and Present State of the Secondary School Library as a Materials Center," PEABODY JOURNAL OF EDUCATION 43:33-39, July, 1965.

Hastings, D.M.H. and Tanner, D., "Influence of Library Work in Improving English Language Skills at the High School Level," JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATION 31:401-05, Summer, 1963.

Hawaii. Department of Education, (QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SURVEY). The Department, 1965.

Helfrich, J.E., "Images of the Past: Myths which Persist in Planning School Library Facilities and Functions," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 14:31-36, March, 1965.

Henne, F.E., "As Good as Librarians Make Them; NDEA Title XI Institutes for School Librarianship," LIBRARY JOURNAL 91:2565-69, May 15, 1966.

Henne, F.E., "The Basic Need in Library Service for Youth," LIBRARY QUARTERLY 25:37-46, January, 1955.

Henne, F.E., "The Challenge of Change, New Standards for New Times," BULLETIN OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS 50:75-81, January, 1966.

Henne, F.E., "Toward Excellence in School-Library Programs," LIBRARY QUARTERLY 30:75-90, January, 1960.

Herald, H.W., PLANNING LIBRARY FACILITIES FOR THE SECONDARY SCHOOL. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1957.

Hodges, E., "Book Selection Practices in the Nation's Schools," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 6:11-15, March, 1957.

Howell, M., "Should School Libraries be Open at Night?" CALIFORNIA EDUCATION 2:3-4, June, 1965.

Huddleston, B.B., A STUDY OF CENTRALIZED SCHOOL LIBRARY SERVICE. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Catholic University, 1956.

Humphrey, J.A., LIBRARY COOPERATION: THE BROWN UNIVERSITY STUDY OF UNIVERSITY-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY LIBRARY COORDINATION IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND. Brown University Press, 1963.

Illinois Association of School Librarians, "Standards for School Library Programs in Illinois," ILLINOIS LIBRARIES 47:337-69, April, 1965.

Itamura, R.S., HOW THE HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARY IS PRESENTED IN BOOKS ON SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1949.

Jahoda, M. et al., THE IMPACT OF LITERATURE: A PSYCHOLOGICAL DISCUSSION OF SOME ASSUMPTIONS IN THE CENSORSHIP DEBATE. American Book Publishers' Council, 1964.

Jay, H. and Yesner, B.L., REPORT ON SCHOOL INSTRUCTION IN LIBRARY SKILLS IN CONNECTICUT. Connecticut School Library Association, 1964.

Johnson, F.K. and Bomar, C.P., "Planning School Library Quarters, an Introductory Note," ALA BULLETIN 50:103-28, February, 1964.

Jones, G.L., "Experiment in Library Instruction for the Retarded," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 35:377, February, 1961.

Jones, M.L.,"Classifying Children's Books," LIBRARY RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SERVICES 9:246-48, Spring, 1965.

Jones, M.L., SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS AND LIBRARY SERVICE TO STUDENTS. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1963.

Jones, R.M., SELECTION AND USE OF BOOKS IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARY. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1953.

Jones, S. and McJenkin, V., "Southern Association Accredits Elementary Libraries," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 14:47-50, October, 1964.

"Kankakee Public Elementary Schools do not have Central Libraries," ILLINOIS LIBRARIES 47:726-27, September, 1965.

Kennon, M.F., "School Library Development - A Long Range Program," ALA BULLETIN 55:421-23, May, 1961.

Kennon, M.F., "Trends in Developing Elementary School Libraries," ALA BULLETIN 56:110-12, February, 1962.

Kiell, N., THE ADOLESCENT THROUGH FICTION; A PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH. International Universities Press, 1959.

Knapp, P. et al., AN EXPERIMENT IN COORDINATION BETWEEN TEACHING AND LIBRARY STAFF FOR CHANGING STUDENT USE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY RESOURCES. (U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project no. 874) Wayne State University, Monteith College, 1964.

Knapp, P., "The Monteith Library Project, an Experiment in Library-College Relationship," COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES 22:256-63, July, 1961.

Koste, M.I., AN EVALUATION OF MAGAZINES PUBLISHED FOR CHILDREN IN AMERICA. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.

Krohn, M.L., "'Learning Center' Experiment at Shaker Heights," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 12:27-30, May, 1963.

Krohn, M.L., "Study in Self-Reliance, Shaker Heights Learning Experiment," LIBRARY JOURNAL 90:4520-22, October 15, 1965.

Kroll, M., ed., ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST. (Pacific Northwest Library Association, Library Development Project Reports, Vol. II) University of Washington Press, 1960.

Lambert, M.W., DESCRIPTION OF A SELECTED GROUP OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANS IN THE UNITED STATES. Unpublished Master's dissertation, University of Texas, 1960.

Lattimer, E.P., LOCAL SCHOOL LIBRARY SUPERVISION IN NEW YORK STATE. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964.

Lattimer, E.P., A STUDY OF CURRICULUM NEEDS FOR EDUCATING SCHOOL LIBRARIANS IN NEW YORK STATE. The Author, 1963.

Lenon, J., A LIBRARY PROGRAM FOR SEVENTH-GRADE GIFTED AND SLOW LEARNERS AT OTTO JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1962.

"Library Services," NEA RESEARCH BULLETIN 36:76-81, October, 1958.

Lively, G.M., "Creative Elementary School Library and Centralized Processing," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 36:753-57, May, 1962.

Lohrer, A., "Status of School Libraries as Materials Centers," ILLINOIS LIBRARIES 45:104-07, February, 1963.

Lowrey, A.M. and Hicks, W.B., PREPARATION AND CATALOGUING TIME FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES. School Library Association of California, Northern Section, 1959.

Lowrie, J.E., ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES. Scarecrow Press, 1961.

Lowrie, J.E., "Providing School Library Services for the Culturally Disadvantaged:V. Fitting the Program to the Problem," ALA BULLETIN 59:49-53, January, 1965.

Lutnick, S.M., "Who Should Choose the Books?," LIBRARY JOURNAL 87:1951-54, May 15, 1962.

McCarthy, I.L.,"The Professional Library in the School: a Tool for Supervisors," ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL 63:160-61, December, 1962.

McCoy, R.E., "Automation in Freshman Library Instruction," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 36:468-70, February, 1962.

McCracken, R.A., "A Two-Year Study of the Reading Achievement of Children who were Reading when They entered First Grade," JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH 59:207-10, January, 1966.

McCreedy, M.L., THE SELECTION OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP AS A CAREER. Unpublished D.L.S. dissertation, Columbia University, 1963.

McCusker, M.G., ACCESSIBILITY OF BOOKS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WITHOUT LIBRARIES. Unpublished D.L.S. dissertation, Columbia University, 1963.

McIntyre, J.P., "Library Cooperation in Dade County," ALA BULLETIN 59:540-42, June, 1965.

Mack, E.B., THE SCHOOL LIBRARY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE TOTAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM OF THE SCHOOL: A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SELECTED PERIODICALS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1957.

McPheeters, A.L., SCARCITY OF CHILDREN'S LIBRARIANS IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES. The Author,(1960?).

MacVean, D.S., A STUDY OF CURRICULUM LABORATORIES IN MID-WESTERN TEACHER-TRAINING INSTITUTIONS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1958.

McWilliams, M., A STUDY OF THE USE MADE OF THE LIBRARY AT THE JUNIOR CLASS LEVEL IN THREE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN SEATTLE, WASHINGTON. Unpublished Master's dissertation, University of Washington, 1960.

Mahar, M.H., CERTIFICATION OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANS. (Bulletin 1958, No. 12) U.S. Office of Education, 1958.

Mahar, M.H., "Federal Legislation and Programs to Assist School Libraries," ALA BULLETIN 60:153-56, February, 1966.

Mahar, M.H., ed., THE SCHOOL LIBRARY AS A MATERIALS CENTER: EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF LIBRARIANS AND TEACHERS IN ITS ADMINISTRATION AND USE. U.S. Office of Education, 1963.

Mahar, M.H., ed., SCHOOL LIBRARY SUPERVISION IN LARGE CITIES. U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

Mahar, M.H., STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES. U.S. Office of Education, 1960.

Mahar, M.H., STATISTICS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARIES, 1960-61. PART II, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION. U.S. Office of Education, 1965.

Mahar, M.H. and Holladay, D.C., STATISTICS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARIES, 1960-61. PART I, BASIC TABLES. U.S. Office of Education, 1964.

Mahoney, S.M., "Centralization of Audio-Visual and Professional Materials," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 37:868-69, June, 1963.

Manlove, D.C. and Beggs, D.W., BOLD NEW VENTURE: FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING USING THE INDIFLEXS MODEL. Indiana University Press, 1965.

Martin, C., "But How do Books Help Children?," LIBRARY JOURNAL 80:2333-37, October 15, 1955.

Martin, L.A., STUDENTS AND THE PRATT LIBRARY: CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY. Enoch Pratt Free Library, 1963.

Maryland. State Department of Education, SCHOOL LIBRARIES OF MARYLAND, 1962-63 SURVEY. The Department, 1964.

Matthews, G.M., "Staff Library Services in Schools for the Mentally Retarded," MENTAL RETARDATION, August, 1963.

Meyer, F.R., LIBRARY FACILITIES AND SERVICES IN NEBRASKA SECONDARY SCHOOLS ACCREDITED BY THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1957.

Monagan, R.T., A STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF LIBRARIES IN THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF ST. LOUIS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1950.

Muller, R.E., "Integrated Library, A Multimedia Approach to Learning; Project Discovery," AUDIOVISUAL INSTRUCTION 10:311-12, April, 1965.

National Education Association, PROFESSIONAL STAFFING RATIOS, 1961-62. (Urban Research Series) The Association, 1962.

National Education Association, SALARY SCHEDULE PROVISIONS FOR LIBRARIANS AND OTHER LIBRARY PERSONNEL, 1962-63. (Research Memo 1963-9) The Association, 1963.

National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers, CONDITIONS OF WORK FOR QUALITY TEACHING. The Association, 1959.

National Education Association, Educational Research Service, EVALUATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL (Educational Research Service, Circular No. 5) The Association, 1964.

National Education Association, Project Instruction, DECIDING WHAT TO TEACH. The Association, 1963.

National Education Association, Project Instruction, PLANNING AND ORGANIZING FOR TEACHING. The Association, 1963.

National Education Association, Research Division, ECONOMIC STATUS OF TEACHERS IN 1964-65. (Research Report 1965 R7) The Association, 1965.

National Education Association, Research Division, MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE TEACHING AND FACILITIES. (Research Monograph 1959 M-1) The Association, 1959.

National Education Association, Research Division, PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION IN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1961-62. (Research Report 1963-R13) The Association, 1963.

National Education Association, Research Division, THE SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHER AND LIBRARY SERVICES. (Research Monograph 1958 M-1) The Association, 1958.

National Education Association, Research Division, WHAT TEACHERS THINK: A SUMMARY OF TEACHER OPINION POLL FINDINGS, 1960-1965. (Research Report 1965-R13) The Association, 1965.

New Jersey. Department of Education, A STUDY OF PRACTICES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF NEW JERSEY 1962-63. The Department, Office of Elementary Education, 1963.

New Jersey Library Association, Library Development Committee, A SECOND REPORT. 1964. (Available from M.V. Gaver, Rutgers University)

New York Library Association, AN INFORMATION SURVEY OF 20 CENTRAL PROCESSING SYSTEMS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK STATE. 1962. (Available from Mrs. Linnea Revere).

Paige, N., "Goals for Service: A Survey of School Library Book Ordering," LIBRARY JOURNAL 90:937-41, February 15, 1965.

Paige, N., "Is it Habit or Law," LIBRARY JOURNAL 89:909-13, February 15, 1964.

Parker, J.R., AN ANALYSIS OF LIBRARY SERVICES IN ELEMENTARY GRADES OF SELECTED CLASSIFIED SCHOOLS IN NORTH CAROLINA. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1962.

Pennsylvania. Department of Public Instruction, PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL LIBRARY SURVEY SUMMARY STATISTICS, 1962-63. The Department, 1963.

Perkins, R., THE PROSPECTIVE TEACHER'S KNOELEDGE OF LIBRARY FUNDAMENTALS. Scarecrow Press, 1965.

Petty, M.C. and Reid, L.A., "Student Use of Public Libraries," ILLINOIS LIBRARIES 45:211-16, April, 1963.

Phillips, M.E. and Lauris, C., PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN OREGON. University of Oregon, Bureau of Business Research, 1962.

Pressler, J., "Organizing Library-Based A-V Materials," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 14:43-47, March, 1965.

Prostano, E.T., AN ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES IN CONNECTICUT AS COMPARED TO NATIONAL STANDARDS, 1960-61. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1962.

Reed, G., "Programmed Instruction: A Challenge to Librarians," PNLA QUARTERLY 27:108-12, January, 1963.

Rioux, J.W., "Nine Tested Reasons for Using Paperbacks," NATION'S SCHOOLS 70:74-76, November, 1962.

Rogers, M.L., "Library Project with Teachers in Training," TOP OF THE NEWS 18:18-24, December, 1961.

Rowell, J., "A Total Book Selection Process," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 41:190-96, October, 1966.

Sabadosh, A., A STUDY OF THREE SIGNIFICANT HIGH-SCHOOL LIBRARIES IN RELATION TO RECENT EDUCATIONAL TRENDS. Unpublished Master's dissertation, Kent State University, 1963.

Sattley, H.R.,"The School Library, Some Obstacles and Objections to the School Library as a Materials Center," ALA BULLETIN 50:373-76, June, 1956.

Schenk, G.K., SURVEY OF THE ARKANSAS LIBRARY COMMISSION AND THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF ARKANSAS. The Commission, 1964.

Schick, F.L., ed., THE FUTURE OF LIBRARY SERVICE: DEMOGRAPHIC ASPECTS AND IMPLICATIONS. University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science, 1961.

Schick, F.L. and Kurth, W.H., THE COST OF LIBRARY MATERIALS: PRICE TRENDS OF PUBLICATIONS. U.S. Office of Education, 1961.

Schick, F.L. et al., "Library Science Research Needs," JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP 3:83-92, Fall, 1962.

Schlessinger, F.H., SCIENCE FACILITIES FOR OUR SCHOOLS K-12. National Science Teachers Association, 1963.

Schwartz, E.E. and Schofield, E.T., "Here's how the Garfield School Teaches Research," EDUCATIONAL SCREEN AND AV GUIDE 44:14-15, June, 1965.

Scuorzo, H.E., AN ANALYSIS OF THE POSITION OF AUDIOVISUAL INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS BUILDING COORDINATOR IN THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF NEW JERSEY. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1961.

Seibert, M.F., REPORT OF THE FACULTY AUDIO-VISUAL SURVEY OF 1962: A STUDY SPONSORED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS. Purdue University, 1962.

Sharp, J.S., "Architectural Steps in Facilities Planning," AUSIOVISUAL INSTRUCTION 10:101-03, February, 1965.

Sheil, M.D., LIBRARY SERVICES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF OHIO, 1955-1963. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1965.

Sherman, M. and Faris, G., "Standards and Evaluative Instruments for Audiovisual Programs," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 15:25-29, May, 1966.

Sizemore, R.A., THE READING INTERESTS AND PREFERENCES OF DEVIATES IN MENTAL ABILITY AND EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH GRADES. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1962.

Slack, K.T., A SURVEY OF CENTRALIZED AND COOPERATIVE LIBRARY ACTIVITIES LOOKING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CENTRALIZED OR COOPERATIVE LIBRARY PROGRAM FOR THE UNIFIED SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1964.

Soares, A.T., INTEREST AND CONTENT OF SOME RECREATIONAL READING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1962.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Committee on Elementary Education, EVALUATING THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM. The Association, 1964.

Spache, G.G., GOOD READING FOR POOR READERS. Rev. ed. Garrard Press, 1960.

Spears, H., "The School Library as the Co-ordinating Agency for the Curriculum," SCHOOL REVIEW 56:400-03, September, 1948.

Srygley, S.K., "A Study of Selected Elementary School Libraries in the Southern Region," PROGRESS IN SOUTHERN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS 2:1-6, April, 1964.

Stull, E.G., A PROPOSAL FOR THE TEACHING OF REFERENCE READING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (WITH) HANDBOOK FOR TEACHERS AND LIBRARIANS GUIDING REFERENCE READING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OR GUIDING DETECTION? DISCOVERY, AND DEVELOPMENT THROUGH REFERENCE READING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1962.

Sullivan, P., "The Knapp High Schools and the ALA Standards," LIBRARY JOURNAL 91: 2609-11, May 15, 1966.

Sullivan, P., "The Knapp School Library Project: a Survey of Applicants," BULLETIN OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS 50:82-88, January, 1966.

Taylor, J.L., "Planning Functional Quarters for the School Library," SCHOOL LIFE 47:16-20, November, 1964.

Tidwell, R. and Wiseblood, E., "Oregon Plan," LIBRARY JOURNAL 90:3686-89, September 15, 1965.

Trinkner, C.L., ed., BETTER LIBRARIES MAKE BETTER SCHOOLS. Shoe String Press, 1962.

Trotter, C.E., A FORTRAN COMPUTER PROGRAM DESIGNED TO IDENTIFY THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES FOR PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTER. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1964.

U.S. Office of Education, LIBRARY FACILITIES FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS. The Office, 1965.

Urell, C. et al., STUDY OF CERTAIN FACTORS RELEVANT TO THE USE OF MASS-MARKET PAPERBACKS IN HIGH SCHOOL LITERATURE CLASSES. New York, New York: Board of Education, 1964.

Vance, K.E., THE PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANS IN MICHIGAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS ENROLLING 500 OR MORE STUDENTS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.

Voss, H., STANDARD TIMES FOR CERTAIN CLERICAL ACTIVITIES IN TECHNICAL PROCESSING. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1964.

Vought, S.W., "Development of the School Library," LIBRARY JOURNAL 48:161-64, February 15, 1923.

Walker, R.D., THE AVAILABILITY OF LIBRARY SERVICE AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT. (Research Series No. 4) Illinois State Library, 1963.

Walker, R.D., "The Quantity and Content of Master's Theses Accepted at Library Schools Offering the Doctor's Degree, 1949-1956," JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP 3:264-79, Spring, 1963.

Warner, J.E., THE ROLE OF THE LIBRARIAN AS A CO-WORKER IN GUIDANCE FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE GUIDANCE WORKER. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1963.

Washington. Office of Public Instruction, SCHOOL LIBRARY AND AUDIO-VISUAL SURVEY. (Research Report 06-01) The Office, 1964.

Werner, E.C., "Cutting Cataloging Costs in the Small Library," LIBRARY JOURNAL 82:32-33, January 1, 1957.

Wert, A.L. and Pell, R.E., "Experiment in Flexible Scheduling," SCHOOL LIBRARIES 14:41-43, May, 1965.

Wezeman, F., COMBINATION SCHOOL AND PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN PENNSYLVANIA. Pennsylvania State Library, 1965.

White, R.M., THE SCHOOL-HOUSED PUBLIC LIBRARY - A SURVEY. American Library Association, 1963.

Whitenack, C.I., "Historical Development of the Elementary School Library," ILLINOIS LIBRARIES 38:143-49, June, 1956.

Whitworth, R.G., AN APPRAISAL OF THE PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY AND THE TECHNIQUES USED BY ENGLISH TEACHERS IN INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN IMPROVING STUDENT READING TASTES. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1964.

Wiese, M.B., CENTRALIZED CATALOGING AND PROCESSING IN THE BALTIMORE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: FIVE YEAR REPORT 1956-1961. (Available from the American Association of School Librarians)

Wiese, M.B., "Shortening Process: Centralized Cataloging and Processing Saves Time and Money," SOUTHEASTERN LIBRARIAN 11:232-41, Fall, 1961.

Willes, P.S., FACTORS DIFFERENTIATING STUDENTS WHO READ EXTENSIVELY FOR PERSONAL USE FROM THOSE OF EQUAL ABILITY WHO DO NOT. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1962.

Williams, A.B., "Adjusting Library Scheduling to Continuous Development Plan; Unscheduled Periods Increase Library Use," CHICAGO SCHOOLS JOURNAL 46:201-05, February, 1965.

Willson, E.J., EVALUATION OF URBAN CENTRALIZED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965.

Winkler, L., "Cooperation and Coexistence: Public and School Libraries," TOP OF THE NEWS 22:188-193, January, 1966.

Winters, J.S., THE INVENTORIED INTERESTS OF MALE LIBRARIANS. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1962.

Wofford, A., "School Library Evolution," PHI DELTA KAPPAN 22:285-88, February, 1940.

Wolfe, B.W., "Cataloging Problems? IBM can Help you," AUDIOVISUAL INSTRUCTION 8:150-51, March, 1963.

Woodward, J.L., "What Type of Atmosphere Radiates from your School Library," BULLETIN OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS 45:134-38, November, 1961.

Wright, G.S. and Greer, E.S., THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL. U.S. Office of Education, 1963.

Ziskind, S., "School Library Budgets," WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 32:420-25, February, 1958.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP; A SURVEY OF AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH (physical format differs slightly from original)

A-1

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP; A SURVEY OF AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH
(physical format differs slightly from original)

LIBRARY SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP; A SURVEY OF AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH

School librarians and library educators have long recognized the need for further research in the field of school librarianship. This survey is an attempt to identify research areas and to indicate their relative importance.

On the following pages are various questions and proposals for needed research in school librarianship. These research needs were identified through a search of the literature, by personal experience, and by querying other school librarians. Acknowledgement is made to the identification in American Association of School Librarians, RESEARCH NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM (May, 1961) and in F.L. Schick et al., "Library Science Research Needs," JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP (Spring, 1963).

The research needs identified in this survey are organized into the following areas:

A. Aims and objectives of school libraries
B. School library standards
C. Patterns of school library administration and control
D. School library personnel
E. Collections
F. Budgets and business practices
G. Accessibility and use
H. Technical processes
I. Publicity and public relations
J. Guidance functions
K. Library instruction
L. State, regional, and federal programs
M. Library research methods and statistics
N. Services to teachers and students, and special programs
O. Housing and equipment
P. Relations with other libraries
Q. Selection and censorship

May we ask you to assist us by considering these questions and by indicating your opinion of the relative importance of each? Please categorize your opinion of each item by circling the appropriate number.

Please return this by _________ to:
Mary L. Woodworth
Library School
University of Wisconsin
425 Henry Mall
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

A SURVEY OF AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH IN SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP

Circle the number that best indicates your opinion on the importance of new research on each item. If you are undecided, draw a line through all the numbers of the item.

The numbers on the scale have the following meanings:

5 - absolutely essential
4 - very important
3 - important
2 - of limited importance
1 - unimportant

A. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF SCHOOL LIBRARIES

1. Contributions of the school library to the learning process(especially effects on academic achievement) 5 4 3 2 1

2. Contributions of the school library to the teaching process 5 4 3 2 1

3. Historical study of school library development 5 4 3 2 1

4. School library laws (devlopment, current status, contrasts among states, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

5. School libraries as instructional materials centers 5 4 3 2 1

6. Status studies of school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

7. *

B. SCHOOL LIBRARY STANDARDS

1. Historical development of school library standards 5 4 3 2 1

2. Study of states' standards and enforcement of standards 5 4 3 2 1

3. Study of regional standards and enforcement 5 4 3 2 1

4. Present status of school libraries as compared with the 1960 "Standards for School Library Programs" 5 4 3 2 1

---

* Space is provided at the end of each area for your suggestions for additions to the list.

5. Establishment and revision of school library standards (How often? By whom? etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

6. How do standards impede or help school library development? 5 4 3 2 1

7. Tools for evaluating school libraries (type, effectiveness, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

8.

C. PATTERNS OF SCHOOL LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL

1. Organization & administration of school libraries in a campus-house organization (large schools organized into self-contained schools or houses) 5 4 3 2 1

2. Relations of local school libraries to regional materials centers 5 4 3 2 1

3. Organizational patterns of multi-librarian school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

4. Practices of organizing & administering elementary, junior high, and/or senior high school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

5. Organizational patterns & problems of public-library-administered school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

6. Relations of elementary, junior, & senior high school libraries & librarians in a school system 5 4 3 2 1

7. Problems & patterns of organization & administration of separate & combined school libraries & audio-visual departments 5 4 3 2 1

8. Comparison of availablity of materials, costs, services, personnel, etc. between centralized school libraries & departmental resource centers 5 4 3 2 1

9. Role of the local school library supervisor, & relationships to local school librarians 5 4 3 2 1

10. Role of the state school library supervisor, & relationships to local school librarians 5 4 3 2 1

11. Exploration of the effectiveness, services, & use of a single "community" library serving junior colleges, elementary & secondary schools & the public 5 4 3 2 1

12. Practices & problems in the use of traveling school librarians (those assigned to more than 1 library in more than 1 building) 5 4 3 2 1

13.

D. SCHOOL LIBRARY PERSONNEL

1. Certification of school librarians 5 4 3 2 1

2. Educational preparation of school librarians (and recency of training) 5 4 3 2 1

3. Training of non-professional library workers 5 4 3 2 1

4. Continuing education of school librarians 5 4 3 2 1

5. The personality & "image" of the school librarian 5 4 3 2 1

6. Use & value of student assistants in the library 5 4 3 2 1

7. Value of student library assistant experience to the student 5 4 3 2 1

8. School librarians as members of professional organizations (participation, benefits, attitudes, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

9. National inventory of school library personnel resources & needs 5 4 3 2 1

10. Working conditions in school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

11. Study of the optimum number of personnel (professional, technical, clerical) required to give adequate service 5 4 3 2 1

12. Study of methods used to fill vacancies temporarily 5 4 3 2 1

13. Study of placement services for school librarians 5 4 3 2 1

14. Study of the motivation of personnel to enter, remain in, or leave school librarianship 5 4 3 2 1

15. Study of recruitment methods & their effectiveness 5 4 3 2 1

16. Study of the mobility of school librarians 5 4 3 2 1

17. Study of the need for double certification requirements for school librarians (education & librarianship) 5 4 3 2 1

18. Study of the distinctions (duties, training, pay, responsibilities, etc.) among clerical, technical, & professional workers in school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

19. Educational preparation of school library supervisors 5 4 3 2 1

20. Certification of school library supervisors 5 4 3 2 1

21. Duties, responsibilities, & workload of local school library supervisors 5 4 3 2 1

22. Role & responsibilities of state school library supervisors 5 4 3 2 1

23. Methods of recruitment & appointment of state school library supervisors 5 4 3 2 1

24. Relations of local school library supervisors with local administrators & with other local supervisors 5 4 3 2 1

25. Special educational preparation/experience for librarians in special programs (e.g., work with the culturally deprived, retarded) 5 4 3 2 1

26. Non-library tasks assigned to school librarians (especially in relation to non-teaching tasks assigned to teachers) 5 4 3 2 1

27. Relative value of classroom teaching experience as background for the school librarian 5 4 3 2 1

28. Relative value of an undergraduate liberal arts background for the school librarian 5 4 3 2 1

29.

E. COLLECTIONS

1. Practices & problems of selling materials (paperbacks, etc.) in school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

2. Professional materials collection - selection, location, size, recency, utilization, etc. 5 4 3 2 1

3. Selection principles for printed materials (especially in different subject areas) 5 4 3 2 1

4. Selection principles for non-print materials (especially in different subject areas) 5 4 3 2 1

5. Effectiveness of selection tools for printed materials (especially in different subject areas) 5 4 3 2 1

6. Effectiveness of selection tools for non-print materials (especially in different subject areas) 5 4 3 2 1

7. Paperback books in libraries (use, costs, effectiveness, organization, etc.)

8. Methods of evaluating school library collections 5 4 3 2 1

9. Various methods of acquiring materials (problems, comparative costs, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

10. Methods & costs of weeding collections 5 4 3 2 1

11. Use & effectiveness of state-approved lists in materials selection 5 4 3 2 1

12. Study of the use, justification, & problems of "closed-shelf" collections 5 4 3 2 1

13. Study of the use, justification, & problems of reserve book collections 5 4 3 2 1

14. Study of the extent of duplication necessary & desirable in a school library 5 4 3 2 1

15. Study of "loss" taes in school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

16.

F. BUDGETS AND BUSINESS PRACTICES

1. Adequacy of school library budgets 5 4 3 2 1

2. Planning & controlling library budgets 5 4 3 2 1

3. Study of business practices & records of school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

4. Problems of allocating library funds to school depts. for purchase of library materials 5 4 3 2 1

5. Methods of allocating, distributing, & accounting for state & federal aids for school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

6. Relationship of the school library budget to the total instructional budget 5 4 3 2 1

7.

G. ACCESSIBILITY AND USE

1. Programs of extended use of school library facilities(evening,weekend,summer) 5 4 3 2 1

2. Evaluating student use of the school library 5 4 3 2 1

3. Accessibility of school libraries to bus-transported students 5 4 3 2 1

4. Patterns of controlling access to school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

5. Use of school libraries by students in independent study programs & in traditionally organized programs 5 4 3 2 1

6. Influence of various factors (such as accessibility on the utilization of library services 5 4 3 2 1

7. Teacher use of school libraries (especially relationships between recency of educational preparation & use, subjects taught & use,etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

8. Administrator's use of school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

9. Advantages/disadvantages of a library-study hall combination 5 4 3 2 1

10. Effect of centralized libraries in all levels of school on teacher/pupil use 5 4 3 2 1

11. Effect of individualized reading programs on pupils' attitudes toward the library 5 4 3 2 1

12. Attitudes of librarians toward the teaching function & the information function, & their possible conflicts 5 4 3 2 1

13.

H. TECHNICAL PROCESSES

1. Centralized services at local, county, state, & regional levels 5 4 3 2 1

2. Use of book-jobbers in acquiring materials 5 4 3 2 1

3. Problems of purchasing & using printed catalog cards 5 4 3 2 1

5. Use of school libraries by students in independent study programs & in traditionally organized programs 5 4 3 2 1

4. Use of commercial processors by school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

5. Problems in the care of books (mending, binding, housing, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

6. Problems in the acquisition & care of periodicals (storage, binding, microfilming, etc) 5 4 3 2 1

7. Evaluating circulation methods 5 4 3 2 1

8. Use of automation in the various phases of library operations 5 4 3 2 1

9. Methods, problems, & costs of organizing, cataloging, storing, & circulating audio-visual materials (including repair) 5 4 3 2 1

10. Study of the use of the catalog, including effectiveness of simplified catalog cards 5 4 3 2 1

11. Which system of classification & arrangement is most effective & useful (Dewey, L.C., "Interest", etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

12. Studies of technical processes (including workplace, process charts, time & motion) 5 4 3 2 1

13.

I. PUBLICITY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

1. Administrators' attitudes toward school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

2. Teachers' attitudes toward school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

3. Community attitudes toward school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

4. Non-school librarians' attitudes toward school libraries and librarians 5 4 3 2 1

5. Examination of school library publicity methods 5 4 3 2 1

6. Students' attitudes toward school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

7.

J. GUIDANCE FUNCTIONS

1. Role of the school library & librarian in guidance 5 4 3 2 1

8. Use of automation in the various phases of library operations 5 4 3 2 1

9. Methods, problems, & costs of organizing, cataloging, storing, & circulating audio-

2. Effectiveness of the library in providing occupational information 5 4 3 2 1

3. Effectiveness of the library in providing information for the college-bound 5 4 3 2 1

4. Relationships between the library & the guidance department. 5 4 3 2 1

5. Personal guidance through books: what role for the librarian? 5 4 3 2 1

6.

K. LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

1. Efficacy of various programs of library instruction for pupils (formal instruction, instruction integrated with teaching units, library orientation, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

2. Articulation of library instruction at all levels 5 4 3 2 1

3. Integrated use of reference materials in the instructional program of the school 5 4 3 2 1

4. Effectiveness of various teaching techniques and devices 5 4 3 2 1

5.

L. STATE, REGIONAL, AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS

1. Role of state departments of education in school library improvement 5 4 3 2 1

2. Role of regional accrediting (& other) associations in school library improvement 5 4 3 2 1

3. Role of library & education associations in school library improvement 5 4 3 2 1

4. Effects of state aids on local school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

5. Effects of federal aids on local school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

6. Survey of school library aid programs on the state and federal levels 5 4 3 2 1

7.

M. LIBRARY RESEARCH METHODS AND STATISTICS

1. Development of a national pattern for the gathering of uniform library statistics at the state & local levels 5 4 3 2 1

2. Gathering, use & effectiveness of statistics in local school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

3. State requirements & patterns in gathering statistics & other information about local school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

4. Effectiveness of various methods of studying school libraries (use studies, cost studies, evaluative methods, attitude, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

5.

N. SERVICES TO TEACHERS AND STUDENTS, AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

1. Role of the library in team teaching 5 4 3 2 1

2. Effect of advanced placement programs on the library 5 4 3 2 1

3. Role of the library in programs for the mentally handicapped 5 4 3 2 1

4. Library orientation practices for teachers (especially new teachers) 5 4 3 2 1

5. Role of the library in programmed/automated instruction 5 4 3 2 1

6. Library programs for the non-library oriented subject areas 5 4 3 2 1

7. Role of the library in programs for the culturally deprived 5 4 3 2 1

8. Student reading (Why? Areas? Sources of materials? Effect of school library?) 5 4 3 2 1

9. Influence of the school librarian on local curriculum development 5 4 3 2 1

10. Functions of the library in programs of reading instruction 5 4 3 2 1

11. Study of the services requested by teachers & students, & effective provision of such services 5 4 3 2 1

12. The school library in teacher education (teacher-training institutions) 5 4 3 2 1

13. Library programs for the gifted 5 4 3 2 1

14.

O. HOUSING AND EQUIPMENT

1. Location of the library within the school 5 4 3 2 1

2. The school library as housed in a separate building 5 4 3 2 1

3. Effective arrangement of facilities and equipment 5 4 3 2 1

4. Study of facilities in a school library 5 4 3 2 1

5. Comparative costs, efficiency, & life of school library equipment 5 4 3 2 1

6. Determination of the desirable library seating capacity in various size schools 5 4 3 2 1

7. Study of the effective use, housing, & equipment of audio-stations, listening booths, listening rooms, electronic carrels & study carrels 5 4 3 2 1

8. Effective methods of organizing & housing special collections (college catalogs, pictures, maps, charts, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

9. Librarian's role in planning new libraries or remodeling old libraries 5 4 3 2 1

10.

P. RELATIONS WITH OTHER LIBRARIES

1. Relationships of school & public library service(distinctive functions & areas of cooperation 5 4 3 2 1

2. Interlibrary loan practices (individual pupil's requests & teachers' requests for class use) 5 4 3 2 1

3. Role of public library service to schools in improving/retarding school library development 5 4 3 2 1

4. Advantages/disadvantages of the school-housed public library 5 4 3 2 1

5. Relations of the school librarian & teachers with the public librarians 5 4 3 2 1

5. Comparative costs, efficiency, & life of school library equipment

6. Determination of the desirable library seating capacity in various size schools 5 4 3 2 1

7. Study of the effective

6. Relationships of student use of school, public and collegiate libraries & effects 5 4 3 2 1

7.

Q. SELECTION AND CENSORSHIP

1. Teacher's role in selection (& educational preparation of teachers in selection) 5 4 3 2 1

2. Administrator's role in selection 5 4 3 2 1

3. Censorship in school libraries by non-school groups or individuals 5 4 3 2 1

4. Internal censorship by librarians or other school personnel 5 4 3 2 1

5. Role of professional organizations in combating censorship 5 4 3 2 1

6. Problems of centralized selection of materials 5 4 3 2 1

7. Effectiveness of book selection committees 5 4 3 2 1

8. Use & effectiveness of book selection policies 5 4 3 2 1

9. Practices & problems of student participation in selection 5 4 3 2 1

10.

A-13

6. [illegible] school, [illegible] effects 4 3 2 1

7.

3. [illegible] groups or individuals 4 3 2 1

4. Internal censorship [illegible] school personnel 4 3 2 1

5. Role of professional organizations in combating censorship 4 3 2 1

APPENDIX B

COPY OF PART II

Library School
University of Wisconsin

Code No. ____________

School Librarianship: A Survey of Areas of Needed Research. Part II.

Please state below those problems of school librarianship which are of prime concern today, which should be included in any list of research needs, and which should have the highest priority.

NOTE: Opinions will not in any way be identified with the person expressing them.

PLEASE RETURN BY JANUARY 13, 1967

COVER LETTER TO ACCOMPANY PART II

Library School
University of Wisconsin
425 Henry Mall
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for the return of the questionnaire on "School Librarianship: A Survey of Areas of Needed Research." We appreciate the time involved in your answering it. The questionnaires are now being tabulated, and the tentative results appear highly interesting.

May we call on you for further comments? Will you review those problems in school librarianship which in your opinion are of prime concern today, and from these will you select those problems which you believe should be included in any list of research needs and should be given the highest priority? We are soliciting your reaction in this way in order (1) to provide you with an opportunity to comment further on research needs, and (2) to provide us with your further considered opinion of needs and priorities in school library research.

We feel that your expressed beliefs, and the tabulated results of the questionnaire, will better enable us to reflect accurately your interest in school library development and research.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Woodworth

MLW/jlo

APPENDIX C

INITIAL LETTER SENT TO ALL LIBRARY LEADERS

Library School
University of Wisconsin
425 Henry Mall
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dear Colleague:

I am working on a project studying areas of school librarianship in which research is needed. The project is composed of two sections. One section is concerned with the identification of needed research areas and their categorization by leaders in school librarianship. The other is an examination of accomplished research. The areas of research needs were identified through a search of the literature, by personal experience, and by querying other school librarians. These areas now require categorization according to their relative importance.

Would you be willing to assist us by examining our list of research needs and giving us your opinion on their importance? The list will be approximately nine pages and will require only a checking to mark your opinion. I am enclosing a post card on which you may reply.

I am hopeful that this project will be useful to school librarians and library educators and will act as a stimulus to further research.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Woodworth
Instructor, Library Science

LETTER ACCOMPANYING SURVEY

Library School
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for your post card indicating your willingness to assist us with "School Librarianship: A Survey of Areas of Needed Research."

I am enclosing a copy of the survey. You will note that we are asking you to circle the number that best illustrates your opinion of the importance of each item.

I am also enclosing a stamped, addressed envelope. May we ask you to return your completed survey by November 21, 1966.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Woodworth
Instructor, Library Science

FOLLOW-UP LETTER ON SURVEY

Library School
University of Wisconsin
425 Henry Mall
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
November 18, 1966

Dear Colleague:

A reminder! May we ask you to return the questionnaire on a survey of areas of needed research in school librarianship. You will recall that this questionnaire, sent you a short time ago, is an attempt to identify and categorize research needs.

Please ignore this reminder if you have already returned the questionnaire.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Woodworth

C-4

FOLLOW-UP LETTER ON SURVEY

Library School
University of Wisconsin
425 Henry Mall
Madison, Wisconsin
53706
November 28, 1966

Dear Colleague:

A reminder! May we ask you to return the questionnaire for "A Survey of Areas of Needed Research in School Librarianship."

Please ignore this if you have already returned it.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Woodworth

APPENDIX D SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES

Frequency tables for all groups are placed first.

The tables can be read by referring to the left-hand side where the area and question numbers are placed. Reading then to the right, and ignoring column 0, the number of responses in the scale from one to five can be determined:

1 - unimportant
2 - of limited importance
3 - important
4 - very important
5 - absolutely essential

For example:

Area A	0	1	2	3	4	5
1	0	0	1	9	34	124

Thus, for question 1 in Area A, one respondent indicated the question was of limited importance, while 124 responded that the question was absolutely essential. Undecided responses are ommitted here.

Following the frequency tables for all groups are the tables for each of the subgroups, all of which can be read in the same manner as the example given.

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLE - ALL GROUPS

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

-VERTICAL SCALE | -HORIZONTAL SCALE-

COLUMN | ENTRY

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	90	79	0	0	0	0
	2	18	18	19	18	18	17
	3	17	16	18	17	16	18
	4	0	36	32	59	42	0
	5	0	169	0	0	0	0
	6	26	0	9	20	38	53
	7	43	19	12	10	13	21
	8	10	24	135	0	0	0
	9	10	70	89	0	0	0
	10	167	2	0	0	0	0
	11	15	1	5	14	10	63
	12	59	33	24	24	7	21
	13	48	11	7	16	13	5
	14	37	2	1	17	20	51
	15	47	15	17	21	10	20
	16	25	44	50	39	11	0
	17	23	28	18	10	15	13
	18	91	60	14	3	1	0
	19	44	14	7	17	14	23
	20	113	38	16	1	1	0
	21	60	32	12	14	8	9
	22	159	10	0	0	0	0
	23	106	11	9	11	9	7
	24	12	1	4	41	28	28
	25	10	101	58	0	0	0
	26	10	46	113	0	0	0
	27	10	91	68	0	0	0
AreaA	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	29	0	0	1	9	34	124
2	30	0	0	0	9	41	116
3	31	0	27	70	56	7	1
4	32	0	5	39	74	36	10
5	33	0	1	7	27	39	91
6	34	0	9	34	61	35	22
Area B	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	36	0	23	66	65	7	0
2	37	0	2	20	47	57	38
3	38	0	1	22	61	54	26
4	39	0	3	8	35	64	56
5	40	0	5	10	37	63	47
6	41	0	1	5	37	70	53
7	42	0	0	2	19	58	88
Area C	43	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	44	0	8	21	69	39	17
2	45	0	3	13	59	58	30
3	46	0	4	10	53	63	35
4	47	0	4	15	45	54	49
5	48	0	20	37	53	30	21
6	49	0	6	21	68	39	32
7	50	0	0	4	21	59	83

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area C							
8	51	0	2	2	36	62	65
9	52	0	0	8	44	61	53
10	53	0	2	14	42	57	51
11	54	0	12	36	50	30	30
12	55	0	6	26	65	45	24
Area D	56	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	57	0	4	11	43	52	55
2	58	0	1	4	28	53	81
3	59	0	5	10	68	49	34
4	60	0	1	8	27	86	44
5	61	0	6	22	51	40	46
6	62	0	8	32	52	44	27
7	63	0	6	24	60	43	32
8	64	0	2	32	55	47	29
9	65	0	2	11	53	44	52
10	66	0	4	15	55	45	45
11	67	0	0	2	25	49	86
12	68	0	16	44	68	25	9
13	69	0	9	53	56	35	8
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 169

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - ALL GROUPS

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

-VERTICAL SCALE- -HORIZONTAL SCALE-

COLUMN ENTRY

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	90	79	0	0	0	0
	2	18	18	19	18	18	17
	3	17	16	18	17	16	18
	4	0	36	32	59	42	0
Area D	5	0	0	(169)	0	0	0
14	6	0	2	10	47	61	43
15	7	0	0	11	53	54	47
16	8	0	7	47	67	40	3
17	9	0	6	14	48	42	52
18	10	0	2	18	58	39	48
19	11	0	0	7	30	71	58
20	12	0	1	11	39	69	45
21	13	0	0	7	47	66	47
22	14	0	0	16	39	59	52
23	15	0	7	20	58	46	32
24	16	0	1	11	48	63	42
25	17	0	1	16	57	65	27
26	18	0	4	33	49	46	32
27	19	0	0	9	57	54	47
28	20	0	0	10	66	53	37
Area E	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	22	0	17	58	64	15	10
2	23	0	4	14	66	48	37
3	24	0	2	12	50	58	45
4	25	0	2	7	35	51	72
5	26	0	0	8	50	60	51
6	27	0	0	5	27	54	82
7	28	0	1	22	75	48	20
8	29	0	0	5	21	54	89
9	30	0	3	11	74	42	36
10	31	0	4	36	68	38	20
11	32	0	10	37	66	27	24
12	33	0	21	48	64	18	13
13	34	0	12	53	66	23	12
14	35	0	3	30	68	38	28
15	36	0	13	53	61	21	20
Area F	37	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	38	0	2	9	36	46	72
2	39	0	2	8	46	64	45
3	40	0	4	27	58	48	29
4	41	0	4	19	71	48	24
5	42	0	1	15	49	53	46
6	43	0	0	5	36	55	71
AreaG	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	45	0	1	4	38	66	59
2	46	0	1	3	29	59	76
3	47	0	2	11	69	54	29
4	48	0	7	16	63	47	32
5	49	0	0	2	35	57	74
6	50	0	0	7	44	65	51

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area G 7	51	0	1	5	23	55	84
8	52	0	6	22	51	50	37
9	53	0	13	40	40	29	41
10	54	0	3	5	21	53	85
11	55	0	1	6	41	66	54
12	56	0	2	10	44	54	55
Area H	57	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	58	0	1	5	23	48	90
2	59	0	11	21	80	42	13
3	60	0	6	26	63	48	22
4	61	0	4	11	58	57	37
5	62	0	20	66	61	13	5
6	63	0	4	29	60	54	20
7	64	0	9	42	74	30	11
8	65	0	1	17	36	51	62
9	66	0	1	6	31	57	72
10	67	0	3	20	59	53	33
11	68	0	12	38	47	37	32
12	69	0	6	18	71	45	27
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 169

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES- ALL GROUPS

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	=VERTICAL SCALE COLUMN					=HORIZONTAL SCALE= ENTRY	
	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	90	70	0	0	0	0
	2	18	18	19	18	18	17
	3	17	16	18	17	16	18
	4	0	36	32	59	42	0
	5	0	0	0	169	0	0
Area I	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	7	0	1	3	23	52	88
2	8	0	1	3	19	55	89
3	9	0	0	8	52	59	48
4	10	0	3	24	47	52	38
5	11	0	7	31	72	41	12
6	12	0	2	4	28	57	75
Area J	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	14	0	3	11	60	56	35
2	15	0	3	17	72	52	21
3	16	0	3	17	72	47	25
4	17	0	4	11	77	50	23
5	18	0	2	14	61	55	34
Area K	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	20	0	0	5	26	52	83
2	21	0	1	3	39	66	58
3	22	0	0	5	34	56	69
4	23	0	1	3	46	55	58
Area L	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	25	0	3	5	41	50	64
2	26	0	1	11	49	54	49
3	27	0	2	8	52	58	43
4	28	0	2	11	52	58	38
5	29	0	1	2	32	57	71
6	30	0	1	10	47	47	56
Area M	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	32	0	5	10	48	36	60
2	33	0	1	22	57	50	31
3	34	0	3	22	63	43	27
4	35	0	0	9	56	54	45
Area N	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	37	0	1	3	38	61	66
2	38	0	1	6	60	61	39
3	39	0	0	19	60	62	26
4	40	0	0	10	49	43	65
5	41	0	1	10	58	48	51
6	42	0	3	15	57	58	31
7	43	0	0	7	45	71	44
8	44	0	0	4	41	67	54
9	45	0	0	2	41	62	62
10	46	0	0	5	41	64	58
11	47	0	2	4	35	75	51
12	48	0	1	1	18	49	98
13	49	0	0	9	58	63	36
	50	0	0	0	0	0	0

```
         CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE
          ROUNDS     0        1        2        3        4        5
Area O
  1        51        0        7       25       64       42       28
  2        52        0        7       34       67       36       17
  3        53        0        3       18       61       49       34
  4        54        0        3       16       67       52       24
  5        55        0        3       32       66       39       25
  6        56        0        6       25       69       39       22
  7        57        0        0        4       33       54       76
  8        58        0        8       20       58       47       33
  9        59        0        3        8       27       62       64
Area P     60        0        0        0        0        0        0
  1        61        0        3        8       36       61       59
  2        62        0        8       17       80       49       12
  3        63        0        5       15       51       59       37
  4        64        0       17       33       60       24       32
  5        65        0        3       12       69       60       21
  6        66        0        1       12       66       57       30
AreaQ      67        0        0        0        0        0        0
  1        68        0        0        2       35       70       60
  2        69        0        3       15       65       53       30
  3        70        0        6       10       50       55       45
  4        71        0        3        7       44       67       45
  5        72        0        2       13       60       66       24
  6        73        0        3       17       51       56       37
  7        74        0        1        9       69       53       34
  8        75        0        0        6       36       67       59
  9        76        0        2       29       71       43       20 -6
           77        0        0        0        0        0        0
           78        0        0        0        0        0        0
           79        0        0        0        0        0        0
           80        0        0        0        0        0        0

              NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS          169
```

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLE- SUBGROUP A

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	~~VERTICAL SCALE~~ COLUMN BOUNDS	~~-HORIZONTAL SCALE-~~ ENTRY 0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	17	19	0	0	0	0
	2	6	7	0	8	6	2
	3	3	2	6	6	4	1
	4	0	(36)	0	0	0	0
	5	0	(36)	0	0	0	0
	6	3	0	0	1	10	19
	7	5	6	2	1	5	6
	8	0	3	33	0	0	0
	9	0	8	28	0	0	0
	10	35	1	0	0	0	0
	11	3	0	0	1	1	10
	12	12	10	7	4	0	3
	13	8	2	0	3	3	1
	14	6	0	0	5	8	13
	15	9	5	3	5	1	3
	16	0	7	14	13	2	0
	17	2	7	6	4	2	1
	18	16	13	7	0	0	0
	19	5	4	0	5	3	7
	20	13	20	2	1	0	0
	21	9	4	5	4	1	1
	22	34	2	0	0	0	0
	23	26	3	1	1	0	2
	24	0	0	0	2	0	5
	25	0	26	10	0	0	0
	26	0	16	20	0	0	0
	27	0	30	6	0	0	0
	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
Area A	29	0	0	0	0	11	25
1	30	0	0	0	0	5	31
2	31	0	8	16	12	0	0
3	32	0	1	14	14	5	1
4	33	0	0	1	5	8	21
5 6	34.	0	1	13	12	6	3
Area B	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	36	0	5	15	13	1	0
2	37	0	0	6	11	8	9
3	38	0	0	6	13	7	8
4	39	0	0	3	6	14	12
5	40	0	1	3	13	12	5
6	41	0	1	1	9	14	9
7	42	0	0	1	3	7	24
AreaC	43	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	44	0	1	7	11	9	6
2	45	0	1	4	11	12	6
3	46	0	1	2	13	11	8
4	47	0	1	6	9	13	7
5	48	0	5	11	8	4	5
6	49	0	2	8	15	6	4
7	50	0	0	1	4	13	18

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLE - SUBGROUPA

TINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area C 8	51	0	1	0	6	14	15
9	52	0	0	1	13	10	12
10	53	0	2	3	10	11	9
11	54	0	2	9	9	6	7
12	55	0	3	5	16	8	4
Area D	56	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	57	0	1	3	10	9	12
2	58	0	1	0	6	12	16
3	59	0	0	2	14	10	9
4	60	0	1	1	6	18	9
5	61	0	0	9	10	8	8
6	62	0	1	9	9	9	7
7	63	0	3	3	13	8	8
8	64	0	2	7	11	10	5
9	65	0	0	4	10	7	12
10	66	0	0	4	13	13	6
11	67	0	0	0	2	10	24
12	68	0	5	8	17	3	3
13	69	0	3	11	14	5	2
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 36

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP A

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	VERTICAL SCALE				HORIZONTAL SCALE		
	COLUMN				ENTRY		
	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	17	19	0	0	0	0
	2	6	7	0	8	6	2
	3	3	2	6	6	4	1
	4	0	36	0	0	0	0
Area D	5	0	0	36	0	0	0
14	6	0	0	3	10	13	10
15	7	0	0	4	11	10	10
16	8	0	1	14	17	2	0
17	9	0	0	3	12	8	13
18	10	0	0	2	12	7	14
19	11	0	0	3	4	17	11
20	12	0	0	3	7	15	10
21	13	0	0	1	9	14	12
22	14	0	0	5	9	10	11
23	15	0	1	7	12	8	7
24	16	0	0	2	8	13	13
25	17	0	0	2	13	14	7
26	18	0	0	5	14	11	4
27	19	0	0	3	8	13	12
28	20	0	0	3	11	12	9
Area E	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	22	0	6	10	18	1	1
2	23	0	2	5	15	10	4
3	24	0	0	4	13	10	9
4	25	0	0	3	7	6	20
5	26	0	0	2	11	11	12
6	27	0	0	2	6	7	21
7	28	0	1	2	18	12	3
8	29	0	0	1	6	7	22
9	30	0	0	3	16	6	9
10	31	0	0	10	14	9	2
11	32	0	2	11	16	2	4
12	33	0	4	14	6	5	6
13	34	0	4	14	7	4	6
14	35	0	1	4	14	9	8
15	36	0	2	9	15	4	6
Area F	37	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	38	0	0	4	3	9	19
2	39	0	0	6	7	10	12
3	40	0	1	10	9	11	13
4	41	0	0	6	12	14	2
5	42	0	0	6	15	5	8
6	43	0	0	2	6	9	18
Area G	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	45	0	0	1	7	12	16
2	46	0	0	1	6	9	20
3	47	0	0	1	17	9	7
4	48	0	0	2	15	9	9
5	49	0	0	2	6	9	19
6	50	0	0	2	8	13	13

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP A

NTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area G 7	51	0	0	2	2	10	22
8	52	0	1	5	6	15	8
9	53	0	4	12	9	5	5
10	54	[redacted]	0	1	2	14	18
11	55	0	0	1	11	12	12
12	56	0	0	2	10	17	7
Area H	57	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	58	0	0	0	5	6	24
2	59	0	3	5	14	8	5
3	60	0	2	5	11	11	7
4	61	0	1	1	10	11	13
5	62	0	4	19	10	1	1
6	63	0	1	6	16	7	6
7	64	0	2	9	14	8	2
8	65	0	0	2	6	10	17
9	56	0	0	1	7	10	18
10	67	0	2	2	11	13	8
11	68	0	2	8	12	7	7
12	69	0	1	4	12	10	8
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 36

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP A

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	VERTICAL SCALE				HORIZONTAL SCALE		
	COLUMN				ENTRY		
	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	17	19	0	0	0	0
	2	6	7	0	8	6	2
	3	3	2	6	6	4	1
	4	0	36	0	0	0	0
	5	0	0	0	36	0	0
Area I	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	7	0	0	1	4	10	20
2	8	0	0	1	3	9	22
3	9	0	0	2	10	11	12
4	10	0	0	6	11	10	7
5	11	0	0	9	15	8	2
6	12	0	0	1	6	11	17
Area J	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	14	0	1	2	14	12	6
2	15	0	0	4	18	12	1
3	16	0	0	3	20	9	2
4	17	0	1	2	19	10	3
5	18	0	1	3	13	13	5
Area K	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	20	0	0	1	2	12	20
2	21	0	0	1	7	17	10
3	22	0	0	3	6	12	13
4	23	0	0	2	9	9	14
Area L	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	25	0	0	1	13	7	13
2	26	0	0	3	12	9	11
3	27	0	0	4	13	11	6
4	28	0	0	6	11	10	6
5	29	0	0	2	7	12	13
6	30	0	0	4	8	9	13
Area M	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	32	0	0	2	9	5	17
2	33	0	0	5	10	10	9
3	34	0	0	5	11	10	7
4	35	0	0	3	7	11	14
Area N	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	37	0	0	0	10	12	14
2	38	0	0	0	15	13	7
3	39	0	0	5	13	12	5
4	40	0	0	3	12	8	13
5	41	0	0	5	10	11	9
6	42	0	0	2	15	12	7
7	43	0	0	1	8	17	10
8	44	0	0	0	9	13	14
9	45	0	0	0	6	13	17
10	46	0	0	2	6	15	13
11	47	0	0	0	8	18	10
12	48	0	0	0	6	9	21
13	49	0	0	2	15	14	5
	50	0	0	0	0	0	0

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP A

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area O							
1	51	0	1	9	14	7	4
2	52	0	2	8	16	6	2
3	53	0	0	5	15	8	7
4	54	0	0	4	16	9	5
5	55	0	0	12	7	8	8
6	56	0	1	7	12	6	9
7	57	0	0	0	7	6	22
8	58	0	1	6	11	9	8
9	59	0	0	2	10	8	15
Area P	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	61	0	0	2	10	14	9
2	62	0	1	4	18	6	5
3	63	0	1	5	10	12	7
4	64	0	2	8	10	8	6
5	65	0	1	5	12	14	3
6	66	0	0	4	14	12	5
Area Q	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	68	0	0	0	7	11	18
2	69	0	2	5	9	10	9
3	70	0	2	0	13	11	10
4	71	0	2	2	8	14	9
5	72	0	0	5	11	17	3
6	73	0	0	5	8	14	8
7	74	0	1	1	13	10	10
8	75	0	0	0	10	11	15
9	76	0	1	8	13	4	9
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS. 36

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLE - SUBGROUP B

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

-VERTICAL SCALE -HORIZONTAL SCALE-

	COLUMN BOUNDS	ENTRY 0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	11	21	0	0	0	0
	2	3	4	4	2	5	2
	3	4	4	4	1	2	3
	4	0	0	32	0	0	0
	5	0	32	0	0	0	0
	6	3	0	3	3	6	14
	7	5	2	2	3	4	6
	8	1	5	26	0	0	0
	9	1	22	9	0	0	0
	10	32	0	0	0	0	0
	11	2	1	3	9	3	7
	12	5	3	3	3	4	14
	13	19	2	2	2	3	1
	14	15	0	0	2	1	4
	15	16	3	1	5	1	2
	16	6	12	9	3	2	0
	17	6	5	3	1	3	3
	18	17	11	2	1	1	0
	19	10	6	3	2	0	4
	20	29	1	2	0	0	0
	21	24	5	0	0	1	1
	22	32	0	0	0	0	0
	23	24	2	0	1	1	1
	24	2	0	0	22	3	4
	25	1	14	17	0	0	0
	26	1	7	24	0	0	0
	27	1	10	21	0	0	0
	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
Area A 1	29	0	0	0	3	4	25
2	30	0	0	0	0	8	22
3	31	0	4	13	12	0	1
4	32	0	1	3	13	14	0
5	33	0	0	1	4	3	24
6	34	0	1	6	12	5	5
Area B	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	36	0	4	7	18	1	0
2	37	0	0	1	3	19	9
3	38	0	0	1	9	19	3
4	39	0	0	1	7	10	14
5	40	0	0	0	3	16	13
6	41	0	0	0	5	13	14
7	42	0	0	0	7	13	12
	43	0	0	0	0	0	0
Area C 1	44	0	2	1	7	13	4
2	45	0	0	1	10	13	5
3	46	0	0	3	11	10	6
4	47	0	0	0	4	8	19
5	48	0	1	4	13	9	2
6	49	0	0	0	10	8	14
7	50	0	0	0	5	9	17

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLE- SUBGROUP B

TINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area C 8	51	0	0	0	9	14	9
9	52	0	0	1	6	14	10
10	53	0	0	2	8	11	11
11	54	0	1	6	11	4	6
12	55	0	1	3	11	11	5
Area D	56	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	57	0	0	2	2	13	15
2	58	0	0	0	4	10	18
3	59	0	0	2	15	7	8
4	60	0	0	0	8	15	9
5	61	0	0	4	8	7	13
6	62	0	0	2	8	14	8
7	63	0	0	1	10	14	7
8	64	0	0	1	6	11	14
9	65	0	0	0	13	10	9
10	66	0	0	1	3	11	17
11	67	0	0	0	4	7	20
12	68	0	1	4	17	8	2
13	69	0	0	5	12	11	3
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 32

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP B

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

-VERTICAL SCALE- -HORIZONTAL SCALE-

	COLUMN BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	11	21	0	0	0	0
	2	3	4	4	2	5	2
	3	4	4	4	1	2	3
	4	0	0	③②	0	0	0
Area D	5	0	0	③②	0	0	0
14	6	0	0	0	9	16	6
15	7	0	0	1	9	9	12
16	8	0	1	4	13	12	1
17	9	0	0	0	11	11	8
18	10	0	0	3	10	8	10
19	11	0	0	1	7	10	13
20	12	0	0	1	9	9	12
21	13	0	0	1	7	10	13
22	14	0	0	1	7	12	11
23	15	0	0	3	8	9	11
24	16	0	0	2	9	14	6
25	17	0	0	3	13	11	4
26	18	0	0	3	6	8	14
27	19	0	0	1	9	13	8
28	20	0	0	1	10	11	9
Area E	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	22	0	1	9	13	4	5
2	23	0	0	2	9	13	8
3	24	0	0	0	6	14	12
4	25	0	0	0	6	13	13
5	26	0	0	1	6	15	10
6	27	0	0	2	3	14	13
7	28	0	0	1	13	11	7
8	29	0	0	0	3	8	21
9	30	0	0	1	11	11	9
10	31	0	0	3	9	11	8
11	32	0	0	3	13	8	7
12	33	0	3	4	18	3	4
13	34	0	0	5	18	6	2
14	35	0	0	4	11	11	6
15	36	0	1	8	10	6	7
Area F	37	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	38	0	0	0	3	11	18
2	39	0	0	0	5	13	14
3	40	0	0	2	9	13	8
4	41	0	1	3	7	12	9
5	42	0	0	0	7	9	16
6	43	0	0	1	4	10	17
Area G	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	45	0	1	0	5	12	14
2	46	0	0	0	6	13	13
3	47	0	0	2	10	13	7
4	48	0	1	3	5	13	10
5	49	0	0	0	4	14	14
6	50	0	0	1	9	12	19

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP B

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area G 7	51	0	0	1	6	9	16
8	52	0	0	4	9	9	10
9	53	0	0	3	6	7	15
10	54	0	0	2	4	12	14
11	55	0	0	1	6	13	12
12	56	0	0	2	8	9	12
AreaH	57	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	58	0	0	4	5	13	10
2	59	0	0	5	17	9	1
3	60	0	0	5	12	10	5
4	61	0	0	4	13	10	5
5	62	0	0	10	13	7	2
6	63	0	0	5	8	13	6
7	64	0	1	5	12	12	2
8	65	0	0	5	12	9	6
9	66	0	0	1	6	12	13
10	67	0	0	4	5	13	10
11	68	0	0	2	10	13	7
12	69	0	0	1	13	12	6
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 32

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLE - SUBGROUP B

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	VERTICAL SCALE COLUMN BOUNDS	HORIZONTAL SCALE ENTRY 0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	11	21	0	0	0	0
	2	3	4	4	2	5	2
	3	4	4	4	1	2	3
	4	0	0	32	0	0	0
	5	0	0	0	32	0	0
Area I	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	7	0	0	0	0	9	23
2	8	0	0	0	2	6	24
3	9	0	0	1	9	8	14
4	10	0	0	3	9	10	10
5	11	0	0	1	19	7	5
6	12	0	0	2	4	5	21
Area J	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	14	0	0	2	8	9	13
2	15	0	0	1	13	8	10
3	16	0	0	1	10	9	12
4	17	0	0	1	13	9	9
5	18	0	0	1	10	9	12
Area K	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	20	0	0	1	2	12	17
2	21	0	0	1	4	10	17
3	22	0	0	0	6	6	20
4	23	0	1	0	7	12	10
Area L	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	25	0	1	0	5	11	14
2	26	0	0	2	7	10	12
3	27	0	0	0	9	11	11
4	28	0	0	2	5	15	9
5	29	0	0	0	4	13	14
6	30	0	0	0	8	15	8
Area M	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	32	0	0	1	12	7	9
2	33	0	0	2	14	7	6
3	34	0	0	2	18	8	1
4	35	0	0	1	18	8	2
Area N	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	37	0	1	1	4	10	16
2	38	0	0	2	9	9	12
3	39	0	0	4	9	12	7
4	40	0	0	0	4	9	19
5	41	0	0	1	10	7	14
6	42	0	1	2	8	13	7
7	43	0	0	3	7	8	13
8	44	0	0	1	5	13	12
9	45	0	0	0	6	10	15
10	46	0	0	0	3	8	20
11	47	0	0	0	7	9	15
12	48	0	0	0	3	8	21
13	49	0	0	2	9	9	12
	50	0	0	0	0	0	20

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP B

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area O							
1	51	0	1	3	5	12	11
2	52	0	0	8	8	9	6
3	53	0	0	2	6	13	11
4	54	0	0	3	8	10	11
5	55	0	0	1	12	13	6
6	56	0	0	1	12	11	8
7	57	0	0	2	5	10	15
8	58	0	0	2	7	14	8
9	59	0	0	0	2	12	17
Area P	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	61	0	0	2	6	14	10
2	62	0	0	3	13	15	1
3	63	0	0	3	10	15	3
4	64	0	1	10	14	3	4
5	65	0	0	1	17	11	3
6	66	0	0	3	11	12	6
Area Q	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	68	0	0	1	8	13	10
2	69	0	0	2	18	9	3
3	70	0	2	5	8	6	10
4	71	0	1	1	10	11	9
5	72	0	0	2	10	12	8
6	73	0	0	4	8	12	8
7	74	0	0	1	13	14	4
8	75	0	0	0	7	14	11
9	76	0	0	4	14	11	3
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 32

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLE - SUBGROUP C

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

-ERTICAL SCALE — -HORIZONTAL SCALE-

	COLUMN			ENTRY			
	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	42	17	0	0	0	0
	2	4	4	9	4	5	4
	3	4	7	4	7	3	10
	4	0	0	0	⑸⑼ 59	0	0
	5	0	59	0	0	0	0
	6	15	0	6	14	13	7
	7	18	5	5	2	3	5
	8	8	10	41	0	0	0
	9	8	26	25	0	0	0
	10	59	0	0	0	0	0
	11	8	0	2	1	4	30
	12	26	10	9	8	2	3
	13	17	4	3	5	4	3
	14	13	1	0	3	5	15
	15	19	2	7	8	7	9
	16	17	21	12	6	3	0
	17	11	9	7	2	7	0
	18	38	19	1	1	0	0
	19	19	2	3	4	9	5
	20	51	3	5	0	0	0
	21	17	20	4	4	4	3
	22	57	2	0	0	0	0
	23	37	2	5	4	4	2
	24	9	1	3	11	18	11
	25	8	30	21	0	0	0
	26	8	7	44	0	0	0
	27	8	23	28	0	0	0
Area A	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	29	0	0	1	3	9	46
2	30	0	0	0	4	18	37
3	31	0	11	27	13	3	0
4	32	0	3	12	28	8	6
5	33	0	1	2	10	15	29
6	34	0	5	9	24	10	9
Area B	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	36	0	8	30	16	3	0
2	37	0	0	8	22	14	14
3	38	0	0	12	24	13	9
4	39	0	2	1	14	23	18
5	40	0	1	5	9	24	20
6	41	0	0	0	12	25	21
7	42	0	0	0	4	21	34
Area C	43	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	44	0	3	6	33	8	3
2	45	0	0	5	21	18	14
3	46	0	0	3	16	24	16
4	47	0	1	5	21	18	14
5	48	0	9	11	16	12	10
6	49	0	0	7	29	15	7
7	50	0	0	2	5	20	32

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP C

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area C 8	51	0	1	1	15	17	24
9	52	0	0	1	17	16	24
10	53	0	0	1	13	19	25
11	54	0	5	11	19	11	12
12	55	0	0	5	25	16	11
AreaD	56	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	57	0	0	2	18	20	18
2	58	0	0	3	8	18	29
3	59	0	2	3	24	19	10
4	60	0	0	4	10	28	15
5	61	0	3	5	19	9	20
6	62	0	4	13	23	12	5
7	63	0	2	12	23	13	7
8	64	0	0	14	22	14	7
9	65	0	0	5	17	15	20
10	66	0	1	3	27	12	14
11	67	0	0	1	8	18	31
12	68	0	4	20	19	8	3
13	69	0	2	21	18	11	3
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 59

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP C

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	VERTICAL SCALE COLUMN	-HORIZONTAL SCALE- ENTRY					
	ROUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	42	17	0	0	0	0
	2	4	4	9	4	5	4
	3	4	7	4	7	3	10
	4	0	0	0	⑤⑨ 59	0	0
Area D	5	0	0	59	0	0	0
14	6	0	1	4	14	20	18
15	7	0	0	3	15	23	17
16	8	0	3	18	24	11	2
17	9	0	3	4	13	16	21
18	10	0	1	5	18	17	17
19	11	0	0	2	9	29	18
20	12	0	0	2	14	28	14
21	13	0	0	1	17	27	14
22	14	0	0	2	11	23	22
23	15	0	2	4	23	19	9
24	16	0	1	2	17	23	15
25	17	0	1	7	22	17	11
26	18	0	0	16	18	15	9
27	19	0	0	2	24	13	20
28	20	0	0	2	30	13	14
Area E	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	22	0	3	25	18	7	3
2	23	0	1	2	22	14	20
3	24	0	0	6	16	22	15
4	25	0	0	3	12	18	26
5	26	0	0	3	17	19	20
6	27	0	0	0	10	19	29
7	28	0	0	9	25	16	8
8	29	0	0	0	5	20	34
9	30	0	2	2	30	14	10
10	31	0	2	15	23	12	7
11	32	0	6	14	18	8	11
12	33	0	8	16	24	6	3
13	34	0	4	19	24	9	3
14	35	0	1	9	25	14	9
15	36	0	6	21	22	5	5
Area F	37	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	38	0	1	3	16	14	24
2	39	0	1	1	21	22	13
3	40	0	2	5	24	16	12
4	41	0	2	4	30	12	11
5	42	0	1	4	14	23	17
6	43	0	0	1	12	20	26
Area G	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	45	0	0	1	15	24	18
2	46	0	1	1	12	21	23
3	47	0	1	1	27	16	13
4	48	0	3	6	27	13	8
5	49	0	0	0	15	18	25
6	50	0	0	3	14	19	22

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP C

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	ROUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area G 7	51	0	1	2	8	18	29
8	52	0	2	7	20	11	17
9	53	0	5	11	14	13	15
10	54	0	0	1	5	10	43
11	55	0	1	1	16	24	17
12	56	0	2	2	16	14	23
Area H	57	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	58	0	0	0	5	17	37
2	59	0	3	6	27	17	6
3	60	0	1	9	21	21	6
4	61	0	0	3	17	25	14
5	62	0	6	25	22	4	2
6	63	0	1	10	21	20	7
7	64	0	3	17	31	5	3
8	65	0	1	6	11	17	24
9	66	0	0	2	8	19	30
10	67	0	1	6	27	14	11
11	68	0	5	13	16	12	13
12	69	0	4	6	21	18	10
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 59

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP C

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	VERTICAL SCALE COLUMN					HORIZONTAL SCALE ENTRY	
	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	42	17	0	0	0	0
	2	4	4	9	4	5	4
	3	4	7	4	7	3	10
	4	0	0	0	59	0	0
	5	0	0	0	59	0	0
Area I	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	7	0	0	2	9	17	31
2	8	0	0	1	7	24	27
3	9	0	0	2	16	25	16
4	10	0	1	9	17	17	15
5	11	0	3	12	25	14	3
6	12	0	0	1	10	23	24
Area J	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	14	0	1	3	23	20	10
2	15	0	0	7	26	18	7
3	16	0	0	6	27	17	8
4	17	0	1	2	30	16	8
5	18	0	1	5	25	16	11
Area K	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	20	0	0	1	10	15	33
2	21	0	1	0	17	21	20
3	22	0	0	0	13	21	23
4	23	0	0	0	18	17	24
Area L	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	25	0	0	1	10	18	30
2	26	0	0	1	18	22	18
3	27	0	0	1	16	23	19
4	28	0	2	1	17	20	18
5	29	0	1	0	9	19	30
6	30	0	0	2	16	16	23
Area M	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	32	0	1	1	16	16	24
2	33	0	0	4	21	21	13
3	34	0	1	5	24	13	16
4	35	0	0	3	15	21	20
Area N	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	37	0	0	1	14	21	23
2	38	0	1	1	21	24	11
3	39	0	0	5	25	19	9
4	40	0	0	5	15	18	19
5	41	0	1	2	24	16	16
6	42	0	0	6	19	20	10
7	43	0	0	1	19	27	12
8	44	0	0	2	18	23	16
9	45	0	0	1	17	24	16
10	46	0	0	2	20	22	15
11	47	0	0	3	9	30	16
12	48	0	0	0	5	21	32
13	49	0	0	2	22	22	11
	50	0	0	0	0	0	39

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP C

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area O 1	51	0	0	7	28	14	10
2	52	0	1	9	28	12	7
3	53	0	1	5	24	14	13
4	54	0	0	5	23	23	6
5	55	0	2	9	28	11	8
6	56	0	1	6	30	15	4
7	57	0	0	0	11	19	29
8	58	0	2	8	26	11	12
9	59	0	0	1	11	24	22
Area P	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	61	0	1	1	11	16	30
2	62	0	1	7	25	20	6
3	63	0	0	2	18	18	21
4	64	0	6	4	21	9	19
5	65	0	1	2	22	20	14
6	66	0	1	0	23	20	15
Area Q	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	68	0	0	1	12	26	18
2	69	0	0	5	19	21	12
3	70	0	2	1	13	24	18
4	71	0	0	2	15	23	18
5	72	0	1	4	23	21	7
6	73	0	1	3	17	19	15
7	74	0	0	3	26	14	14
8	75	0	0	1	13	20	24
9	76	0	0	5	28	18	6
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 59

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP D

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

VERTICAL SCALE		-HORIZONTAL SCALE-					
	COLUMN	ENTRY					
	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	20	22	0	0	0	0
	2	5	3	6	4	2	9
	3	6	3	4	3	7	4
	4	0	0	0	0	⓸⓶ 42	0
	5	0	42	0	0	0	0
	6	5	0	0	2	9	13
	7	15	6	3	4	1	4
	8	1	6	35	0	0	0
	9	1	14	27	0	0	0
	10	41	1	0	0	0	0
	11	2	0	0	3	2	16
	12	16	10	5	9	1	1
	13	4	3	2	6	3	0
	14	3	1	1	7	6	19
	15	4	5	6	3	1	6
	16	2	4	15	17	4	0
	17	4	7	2	3	3	9
	18	20	17	4	1	0	0
	19	10	2	1	6	2	7
	20	20	14	7	0	1	0
	21	10	3	3	6	2	4
	22	36	6	0	0	0	0
	23	19	4	3	5	4	2
	24	1	0	1	6	7	8
	25	1	31	10	0	0	0
	26	1	16	25	0	0	0
	27	1	28	13	0	0	0
AreaA	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	29	0	0	0	3	10	28
2	30	0	0	0	5	10	26
3	31	0	4	14	19	4	0
4	32	0	0	10	19	9	3
5	33	0	0	3	8	13	17
6	34	0	2	6	13	14	5
AreaB	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	36	0	6	14	18	2	0
2	37	0	2	5	11	16	6
3	38	0	1	3	15	15	6
4	39	0	1	3	8	17	12
5	40	0	3	2	12	11	9
6	41	0	0	4	11	18	9
7	42	0	0	1	5	17	18
AreaC	43	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	44	0	2	7	18	9	4
2	45	0	2	3	17	15	5
3	46	0	3	2	13	18	5
4	47	0	2	4	11	15	9
5	48	0	5	11	16	5	4
6	49	0	4	6	14	10	7
7	50	0	0	1	7	17	16

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP D

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area C 8	51	0	0	1	6	17	17
9	52	0	0	5	8	21	7
10	53	0	0	8	11	16	6
11	54	0	4	10	11	9	5
12	55	0	2	13	13	10	4
Area D	56	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	57	0	3	4	13	10	10
2	58	0	0	1	10	13	18
3	59	0	3	3	15	13	7
4	60	0	0	3	3	25	11
5	61	0	3	4	14	16	5
6	62	0	3	8	12	9	7
7	63	0	1	8	14	8	10
8	64	0	0	10	16	12	3
9	65	0	2	2	13	12	11
10	66	0	3	7	12	9	8
11	67	0	0	1	11	14	11
12	68	0	6	12	15	6	1
13	69	0	4	16	12	8	0
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 42

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP D

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	-VERTICAL SCALE COLUMN BOUNDS	-HORIZONTAL SCALE- ENTRY 0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	20	22	0	0	0	0
	2	5	3	6	4	2	9
	3	6	3	4	3	7	4
	4	0	0	0	0	42	0
Area D	5	0	0	42	0	0	0
14	6	0	1	3	14	12	9
15	7	0	0	3	18	12	8
16	8	0	2	11	13	15	0
17	9	0	3	7	12	7	10
18	10	0	1	8	18	7	7
19	11	0	0	1	10	15	16
20	12	0	1	5	9	17	9
21	13	0	0	4	14	15	8
22	14	0	0	8	12	14	8
23	15	0	4	6	15	10	5
24	16	0	0	5	14	13	8
25	17	0	0	4	9	23	5
26	18	0	4	9	11	12	5
27	19	0	0	3	16	15	7
28	20	0	0	4	15	17	5
Area E	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	22	0	7	14	15	3	1
2	23	0	1	5	20	11	5
3	24	0	2	2	15	12	9
4	25	0	2	1	10	14	13
5	26	0	0	2	16	15	9
6	27	0	0	1	8	14	19
7	28	0	0	10	19	9	2
8	29	0	0	4	7	19	12
9	30	0	1	5	17	11	8
10	31	0	2	8	22	6	3
11	32	0	2	9	19	9	2
12	33	0	6	14	16	4	0
13	34	0	4	15	17	4	1
14	35	0	1	13	18	4	5
15	36	0	4	15	14	6	2
Area F	37	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	38	0	1	2	14	12	11
2	39	0	1	1	13	19	6
3	40	0	1	10	16	8	6
4	41	0	1	6	22	10	2
5	42	0	0	5	13	16	5
6	43	0	0	1	14	16	10
Area G	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	45	0	0	2	11	18	11
2	46	0	0	1	5	16	20
3	47	0	1	7	15	16	2
4	48	0	3	5	16	12	5
5	49	0	0	0	10	16	16
6	50	0	0	1	13	21	7

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES⁄- SUBGROUP D

~~CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE~~

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area G 7	51	0	0	0	7	18	17
8	52	0	3	6	16	15	2
9	53	0	4	14	11	4	6
10	54	0	3	1	10	17	10
11	55	0	0	3	8	17	13
12	56	0	0	4	10	14	13
Area H	57	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	58	0	1	1	8	12	19
2	59	0	5	5	22	8	1
3	60	0	3	7	19	6	4
4	61	0	3	3	18	11	5
5	62	0	10	12	16	1	0
6	63	0	2	8	15	14	1
7	64	0	3	11	17	5	4
8	65	0	0	4	7	15	15
9	66	0	1	2	10	16	11
10	67	0	0	8	16	13	4
11	68	0	5	15	9	5	5
12	69	0	1	7	25	5	3
	70	0	0	0	0	0	0
	71	0	0	0	0	0	0
	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 42

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP D

SIMPLE FREQUENCY FOR EACH COLUMN

	VERTICAL SCALE COLUMN BOUNDS	HORIZONTAL SCALE ENTRY 0	1	2	3	4	5
	1	20	22	0	0	0	0
	2	5	3	6	4	2	9
	3	6	3	4	3	7	4
	4	0	0	0	0	⓸42	0
	5	0	0	0	42	0	0
Area I	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	7	0	1	0	10	16	14
2	8	0	1	1	7	16	16
3	9	0	0	3	17	15	6
4	10	0	2	6	10	15	6
5	11	0	4	9	13	12	2
6	12	0	2	0	8	18	13
Area J	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	14	0	1	4	15	15	6
2	15	0	3	5	15	14	3
3	16	0	3	7	15	12	3
4	17	0	2	6	15	15	3
5	18	0	0	5	13	17	6
Area K	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	20	0	0	2	12	13	13
2	21	0	0	1	11	18	11
3	22	0	0	2	9	17	13
4	23	0	0	1	12	17	10
Area L	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	25	0	2	3	13	14	7
2	26	0	1	5	12	13	8
3	27	0	2	3	14	13	7
4	28	0	0	2	19	13	5
5	29	0	0	0	12	13	14
6	30	0	1	4	15	7	12
Area M	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	32	0	4	6	11	8	10
2	33	0	1	11	12	12	3
3	34	0	2	10	10	12	3
4	35	0	0	2	16	14	9
Area N	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	37	0	0	1	10	18	13
2	38	0	0	3	15	15	9
3	39	0	0	5	13	19	5
4	40	0	0	2	18	8	14
5	41	0	0	2	14	14	12
6	42	0	2	5	15	13	7
7	43	0	0	2	11	19	9
8	44	0	0	1	9	18	12
9	45	0	0	1	12	15	14
10	46	0	0	1	12	19	10
11	47	0	2	1	11	18	10
12	48	0	1	1	4	11	24
13	49	0	0	3	12	18	8
	50	0	0	0	0	0	0

SIMPLE FREQUENCY TABLES - SUBGROUP D

CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS TABLE

	BOUNDS	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area O							
1	51	0	5	6	17	9	3
2	52	0	4	9	15	9	2
3	53	0	2	6	16	14	3
4	54	0	3	4	20	10	2
5	55	0	1	10	19	7	3
6	56	0	4	11	15	7	1
7	57	0	0	2	10	19	10
8	58	0	5	4	14	13	5
9	59	0	3	5	4	18	10
Area P	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	61	0	2	3	9	17	10
2	62	0	6	3	24	8	0
3	63	0	4	5	13	14	6
4	64	0	8	11	15	4	3
5	65	0	1	4	18	15	1
6	66	0	0	5	18	13	4
Area Q	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	68	0	0	0	8	20	14
2	69	0	1	3	19	13	6
3	70	0	0	4	16	14	7
4	71	0	0	2	11	19	9
5	72	0	1	2	16	16	6
6	73	0	2	5	18	11	6
7	74	0	0	4	17	15	6
8	75	0	0	5	6	22	9
9	76	0	1	12	16	10	2
	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	0	0	0	0	0	0
	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS IS 42

ERIC REPORT RESUME

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACCESSION NO

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER

RESUME DATE 1-1-68

P.A.

T.A.

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO ☐

TITLE
The Identification and Examination of Areas of Needed Research in School Librarianship (Final Report)

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
Woodworth, Mary L.

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., Library School

SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

PUB'L. DATE 1-1-68

CONTRACT GRANT NUMBER OE-6-10-347

PAGINATION, ETC.
246p.

RETRIEVAL TERMS
Research in School Librarianship

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
This project identified research problem-areas in school librarianship and indicated the relative importance of the areas, contrasted to existing research in the field. Data on relative importance was gathered through questionnaires to school-library leaders. The leaders were principally concerned with library instruction, services, and state and federal programs. Items of greatest concern were the library's contributions to the teaching/learning process, teacher education and the library, and instructional materials centers. Another major concern was the education of school librarians. An examination of the expressed concerns with existing research revealed that current experimental research in school librarianship was almost non-existent, despite the interest shown in almost every area of research problems, as demonstrated by the responses in this project.